

ECONOMETRIC INFERENCE ON LARGE BAYESIAN GAMES WITH HETEROGENEOUS BELIEFS

KYUNGCHUL SONG

ABSTRACT. Econometric models on games often assume observation of many replications of a single representative game. Such a framework is not adequate when one observes multiple heterogeneous many-player games, as in many models of social interactions. This paper considers a static large Bayesian game, and develops inference methods which does not require a common prior assumption, and allows for the players to form beliefs differently from other players. By drawing on the main intuition of Kalai (2004), this paper introduces the notion of a hindsight regret which measures each player's ex post value of other players' type information, and obtains its belief-free bound. From this bound, this paper derives testable implications and develops an asymptotic inference procedure for the structural parameters.

KEY WORDS. Large Game; Incomplete Information; Heterogenous Beliefs; Bayesian Nash Equilibria; Ex Post Stability; Hindsight Regrets; Cross-Sectional Dependence; Partial Identification; Moment Inequalities.

JEL SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION. C13, C31.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many economic outcomes arise as a consequence of agents' decisions under the influence of others' choices. Endogeneity of such influence poses the main challenge for an empirical researcher. In response to this challenge, a strand of empirical methods explicitly model interactions among the agents. These models often share two main features. First, they assume observation of many i.i.d. replications from a single representative game, so that statistical independence is imposed across the replications, whereas strategic interdependence is kept within each replication. Second, they rely on a common prior assumption, where

Date: April 9, 2014.

I thank Andres Aradillas-Lopez, Aureo de Paula, Hiro Kasahara, Jinwoo Kim, Sokbae Lee, Wei Li, Vadim Marmer and Mike Peters for useful conversations and comments. I also thank participants at Cowles Summer Conference at Yale University, and seminar participants at Seoul National University, UBC, University of Texas at Dallas, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin-Madison for their comments. I am grateful to Yoram Halevy, Wei Li, Qingmin Liu, and Mike Peters for their kind and patient answers to my numerous elementary questions on Bayesian games. Last but not least, I thank Bruce Hansen and Joon Park for their encouragements at the early stage of this research. All errors are mine. I acknowledge that this research was supported by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Corresponding address: Kyungchul Song, Vancouver School of Economics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada. Email address: kysong@mail.ubc.ca.

the type distribution is assumed to be common knowledge among the players. (See Bresnahan and Reiss (1991), Tamer (2003), Ciliberto and Tamer (2009), Aradillas-Lopez (2010), Beresteanu, Molchanov, and Molinari (2011), Aradillas-Lopez and Tamer (2008), and de Paula and Tang (2011), among many others, for methodological contributions.¹)

Such a framework does not fit well a situation where there are interactions among many agents. For example, consider studying peer effects among students. One may view interactions among the students in each school as one game. Each school has a different number of students. In order to view the games as arising from a single representative game, one introduces further specifications such as whether the equilibrium is selected across schools differently or not, whether the strategies of students in the same school are the same or not, etc. This observation applies to many other examples, such as studies on neighborhood effects on the choice of housing location or on the effect of friendship networks on the students' smoking behavior. Many such examples are found in the literature of social interactions. (See Brock and Durlauf (2001b and 2007) for their pioneering works on the structural modeling of social interactions. See also surveys by Brock and Durlauf (2001a) and a recent monograph by Ioannides (2013) for this literature.)

This paper proposes an alternative modeling view in which heterogeneity across the games and heterogeneity across the players are given characteristics of a single large Bayesian game. For example, in the study of the peer effects mentioned before, this framework views interactions within each school as a subgame of a large game, where subgames are allowed to be heterogeneous in various aspects such as the number of the players, their payoff specifications, and the way they form beliefs about other players' types. Furthermore, the sets of subgame equilibria across different subgames are not required to be identical.²

The econometrician observes outcomes from a pure strategy Bayesian Nash equilibrium (possibly among multiple equilibria), and attempts to make inference about the structural parameters of the game. While the equilibrium is driven by the subjective beliefs of the players, the validity of the econometrician's inference is measured in terms of the Nature's objective probability. Thus the inference procedure in this paper is valid regardless of how an

¹Also see Chernozhukov, Hong and Tamer (2007), Rosen (2008), Bugni (2010), Andrews and Soares (2010), Andrews and Shi (2013), Chernozhukov, Lee and Rosen (2013), among many others, for general theory of inference for models under moment inequality restrictions. Note that the representative game models have been among the main motivation behind this literature. Among the notable exceptions to this representative small game framework are Xu (2010), Bisin, Mora and Topa (2011), and Menzel (2012). We will discuss these papers briefly later.

²This paper confines attention to simultaneous-move games with an unordered finite action space. Hence auction models with continuous bids are excluded. Global network games with endogenous network formation or matching games are also excluded because the action space increases as the number of players increases.

equilibrium is selected, or whether the sets of equilibria across different games are identical or not.³

The main departure of this model from the existing literature is that the players are allowed to form beliefs differently from each other. Regarding the subjective beliefs of the players, it is assumed that they commonly (and correctly) believe that the types are conditionally independent given their public signal, and that any event a player believes highly likely to occur does occur with high probability. Within the boundary of these two conditions, each player is allowed to form beliefs differently using potentially different priors. Thus the inference procedure in this paper is robust to the way individual players form their beliefs about other players' types or beliefs. If it is desirable that the predictions from game models be robust to particular assumptions about individual players' belief formation, as emphasized by Wilson (1989) and Bergemann and Morris (2005), the same may apply all the more to econometric inference on such models.⁴

The main challenge for the econometrician in this environment is to recover the subjective beliefs. Manski (2004) proposes using data on subjective probabilities in choice studies. See Dominitz and Manski (1997) for a study on subjective income expectations, and Li and Lee (2009) for an investigation of rational expectations assumptions in social interactions using subjective expectations data. However, in strategic environments with many players, it is often not easy to procure data on players' expectations on other players' types prior to the play.

Instead of attempting to recover subjective beliefs, this paper develops what this paper calls a *hindsight regret approach*, based on the insights of Kalai (2004) and Deb and Kalai (2010). The *hindsight regret* for each player measures *ex post* payoff loss due to the player's not being able to observe the other players' types. More specifically, the hindsight regret quantifies the amount of additional compensation needed to preserve each player's incentive compatibility constraint in equilibrium even after all the players' types are revealed. This paper provides a general form of belief-free hindsight regret which is used to form an *ex post* version of incentive compatibility constraints for each player in equilibrium.

³Note that the notion of an equilibrium selection rule in the literature already presumes replications of a single representative game. When two games are different with different sets of equilibria, there cannot be an equilibrium selection rule that applies to both the games.

⁴Note the unique contribution by Aradillas-Lopez and Tamer (2008) for various implications of assumptions of higher order beliefs in econometric game models. The main difference between Aradillas-Lopez and Tamer (2008) and this paper is two fold. First, Aradillas-Lopez and Tamer (2008) focused on level k rationalizability where uncertainty faced by a player is about other players' actions, whereas uncertainty faced by a player in this paper's game is confined to other players' payoff types. Second, the main purpose of the study by Aradillas-Lopez and Tamer (2008) was to explore implications of various higher order belief configurations for econometric inference, whereas this paper pursues an inference method robust to various higher order belief configurations within the Nash equilibrium framework.

Using the *ex post* incentive compatibility constraints, this paper derives testable implications which the econometrician can use for inference without knowledge of a particular way beliefs are formed. The implications are formulated as moment inequalities in a spirit similar to Ciliberto and Tamer (2009). The tightness of the moment inequalities (thus the nontriviality of subsequent inference) depends on how strongly any two players are strategically interdependent. When the reference group is large, and each player's payoff is affected by the action of another player in inverse proportion to the group sizes, the inequalities can be fairly tight, opening the possibility of nontrivial inference. On the other hand, this condition excludes the situation where the econometrician observes many small private information games as in Aradillas-Lopez (2010) and de Paula and Tang (2011).

For inference, the paper proposes two wild bootstrap methods and establishes their asymptotic validity, as the number of the players increases to infinity. The asymptotic validity is uniform over the probabilities that the Nature adopts for drawing the players' types. This paper's approach for inference is inspired by the work of Andrews (2005) who investigated the inference problem in the presence of common shocks in short panel data. (See Kuersteiner and Prutch (2012) for a related research on dynamic panel models.) As in Andrews (2005), the test statistic proposed in this paper has a functional of a mixture normal distribution as its limiting distribution in the least favorable configuration of the null hypothesis, but we cannot use the random norming as he did to pivotize the test statistic, because the restrictions here are inequalities rather than equalities. The method of wild bootstrap in this paper obviates the need to pivotize the test statistic.

Later the paper presents a Monte Carlo simulation study based on a social interactions model. First, it is found that the larger the hindsight regrets are, the more conservative the inference becomes. This finding is intuitive. When the hindsight regrets are large, the testable restrictions are not strong enough to give nontrivial information about the structural parameters. Second, even when the coverage probabilities are reported to be 1, the bootstrap inference may exhibit good power properties. Third, when the social interaction parameter is positive, its confidence set covers zero with almost zero probability, which means the bootstrap procedure detects deviation from the null hypothesis of no social interaction extremely well. Fourth, the results show that ignoring the hindsight regrets lead to invalid inference in general.

The existing econometrics literature of games often assumes observation of many independent replications from a single representative game, so that statistical independence is imposed across the replications, whereas strategic interdependence is kept within each replication. See Bresnahan and Reiss (1991), Tamer (2003), Ciliberto and Tamer (2009), Aradillas-Lopez (2010), Bajari, Hong, Krainer and Nekipelov (2010), Beresteanu, Molchanov, and

Molinari (2011), Aradillas-Lopez and Tamer (2008), and de Paula and Tang (2011) for example. See de Paula (2010) for references. See Krauth (2006) and de Paula (2010) for using the framework of many replications of a representative game in analysis of social interactions among people. In contrast to such a framework, this paper's approach does not require that one observe many games for asymptotically valid inference. The asymptotic validity holds as long as the number of the players is large, regardless of how they are partitioned into different subgames. This feature is convenient in particular, for it accommodates a single large game such as a social interactions model with multiple large overlapping reference groups.

This paper's framework is most relevant to various models of social interactions. As a seminal paper in the structural modeling and estimation of social interactions, Brock and Durlauf (2001) developed discrete choice-based models of social interactions. Their discrete-choice based approach influenced many researches such as Krauth (2006), Ioannides and Zabel (2008), and Li and Lee (2009) to name but a few. (See Blume, Brock, Durlauf, and Ioannides (2011) and the monograph by Ioannides (2010) for recent methodological progresses in the literature of social interactions.) In contrast with this approach, this paper relaxes symmetry of equilibrium strategies or rational expectations. Furthermore, this paper fully develops a bootstrap inference procedure which is asymptotically valid regardless of whether there are multiple equilibria, or how the equilibrium is selected across different games. On the other hand, the approach of Brock and Durlauf, within the boundary of their set-up, is simpler to use than this paper's approach.

It is also worthwhile to compare this paper's approach with recent researches by Xu (2012), Bisin, Moro, and Topa (2011), and Menzel (2012). These researches are more explicit about the inferential issues in a large game model. Xu (2012) studied a single large Bayesian game framework like this paper, but his inference procedure requires various conditions that yield uniqueness of the equilibrium and point-identification of the parameters. On the other hand, Bisin, Moro, and Topa (2011) admit multiple equilibria, but their equilibrium concept requires asymptotic stability of the aggregate quantities (as the number of the players increases). Menzel (2012) recently developed asymptotic theory for inference based on large complete information games where type-action profiles are (conditionally) exchangeable sequences.⁵

This paper is organized as follows. The first section formally introduces a large Bayesian game, and discusses examples. Section 3 introduces a belief-free version of hindsight regrets.

⁵The fundamental difference between Menzel (2012) and this paper lies in modeling the probability of observations. Menzel employs a complete information game model where the randomness of the observed outcomes is mainly due to the sampling variations. Thus random sampling schemes and their variants justify his exchangeability conditions. On the other hand, this paper considers an incomplete information game, where the randomness of observed outcomes stems from the inherent heterogeneity across players due to Nature's drawing of types.

Section 4 turns to the assumptions for econometric inference, and derives testable implications. Section 5 proposes general inference methods and establishes their uniform asymptotic validity. Section 6 presents and discusses Monte Carlo simulation results. For simplicity of exposition, most of the results in the paper are obtained assuming a binary action space. Their extension to the case of a general finite action set is provided in the appendix.

A supplemental note to this paper is available. The note consists of three sections. The first section explains in detail how the belief-free hindsight regrets and general testable implications in the paper can be derived for various parametric specifications of payoffs in social interactions models. The second section offers a multivariate version of McDiarmid's inequality and its proof. The inequality is crucial for deriving a belief-free version of hindsight regret. The third section presents the full mathematical proofs of the results in the paper.

2. A LARGE BAYESIAN GAME WITH INFORMATION GROUPS

2.1. Information Groups of Players. In this section, we introduce formally a Bayesian game that essentially defines the scope of the paper. Assumptions relevant to econometric inference appears in Section 4. The game is played by N players, where each player $i \in \mathbb{N} \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ chooses an action from a common finite action set $\mathbb{A} \equiv \{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_K\}$.

At the beginning of the game, the Nature draws an outcome ω from a sample space Ω which realizes the (payoff) type profile

$$T(\omega) = (T_1(\omega), \dots, T_N(\omega)) \in \mathbb{T}^N,$$

for the N players, where $T_i(\omega) \in \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbf{R}^t$ represents a finite dimensional type vector for player i . Let the distribution of T chosen by the Nature be denoted by P .

Each player belongs to a group $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ called *information group*, where players in the group s commonly observe public signal C_s . Without losing generality, we assume that C_s is a subvector of T_i for each player i in information group s . The types are conditionally independent given public signals C_s . No player shares her type information with other players (except for the public signal C_s that is already shared). In many empirical examples, different information groups can be thought of either as separate games observed by the econometrician, or as large overlapping reference groups of players in a single game. (Examples are given later.)⁶

⁶The information group structure belongs to common knowledge among the players, and is exogenously formed prior to the current game. The assumption of exogenous group formation is plausible when the players are randomly assigned to groups only based on some public signals, or the group formation has almost no relevance to the current game. For example, consider a study on the presidential election among reference groups with similar demographic characteristics. In this case, the formation of the demographic groups has little relevance to the subsequent decisions in the election. However, there are also many other situations where the group formation is directly relevant to the current game. Extending the framework to endogenous group formation requires a separate paper.

Once the Nature draws a type profile T that realizes to be $t = (t_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$, each player i observes t_i and forms a belief on T . The belief is denoted by $Q_i(\cdot|t_i)$, a probability measure on $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ for each t_i . Thus P is the *objective probability* that the econometrician uses to express the validity of his inference method, whereas Q_i is a *subjective probability* formed by player i according to her prior and possibly through her higher order beliefs about other players' beliefs. As Aumann (1976) pointed out, when P belongs to common knowledge, we have $Q_i(\cdot|t_i) = P(\cdot|t_i)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$, (denoting the number of the players in i , and $P(\cdot|t_i)$ the conditional distribution of T given $T_i = t_i$ under P) so that the distinction between the objective and subjective probabilities is not necessary. Here it is, as we are not making such an assumption.

We introduce a conditional independence assumption for P and Q_i 's.

ASSUMPTION 1 (CONDITIONAL INDEPENDENCE UNDER OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE PROBABILITIES): $\{T_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is conditionally independent given $C = (C_s)_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ both under P and under $Q_i(\cdot|t_i)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$.

By Assumption 1, any two players have types that are conditionally independent given the public signals C according to both the objective and subjective probabilities.

ASSUMPTION 2 (ONE-SIDED RATIONAL EXPECTATIONS ON HIGH PROBABILITY EVENTS): There exists a small $\rho > 0$ such that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and any event $B \subset \mathbb{T}$ such that $Q_i(B|T_i = t_i) \geq 1 - \rho$ for all $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$, it is satisfied that $P\{B|T_i = t_i\} \geq 1 - \rho$ for all $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$.

Assumption 2 says that any event that a player believes strongly to occur is highly likely to occur according to the objective probability. This assumption imposes a limited (one-sided) version of rational expectations on the players' beliefs on events that are believed to be highly likely by the players. The version is one-sided in the sense that a high probability event (according to the Nature's experiment) is not necessarily viewed as a high probability event by each player.

Once the Nature draws $T = t$ with distribution P , each player i , facing the other players choosing $a_{-i} \in \mathbb{A}^{N-1}$, receives payoff $u_i(a_i, a_{-i}; t_i)$ from choosing $a_i \in \mathbb{A}$, so that the payoff of player i depends only on the players' actions and her own type. The latter condition is not as strong as it may seem at first, because the individual type vector T_i contains a public signal C_s as a subvector.

A *pure strategy* y_i for player i is an $\mathbb{A}$ -valued map on $\mathbb{T}$, and a *pure strategy profile* $y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$, a vector of individual pure strategies. Given a profile y , the (interim)

expected payoff for player $i \in \mathbb{N}$ is given by

$$U_i(y|t_i) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^N} u_i(y(t); t_i) Q_i(dt|t_i),$$

where $y(t) = (y_i(t_i))_{i=1}^N$. A strategy profile y is a *pure strategy Bayesian Nash equilibrium*, if for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$, and any pure strategy y'_i for i ,⁷

$$(2.1) \quad U_i(y|t_i) \geq U_i(y'_i, y_{-i}|t_i).$$

This paper does not place restrictions on subjective beliefs Q_i other than Assumptions 1-2.⁸

Instead of directly observing a strategy profile, the econometrician observes its realized action profile. Given a pure strategy equilibrium $y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$, define

$$(2.2) \quad Y_i \equiv y_i(T_i),$$

and let $Y \equiv (Y_1, \dots, Y_N) \in \mathbb{A}^N$. The econometrician observes Y_i 's and part of T_i 's. (We will specify the econometrician's observations later.) The equation (2.2) is a *reduced form* for Y_i . When the game has multiple equilibria, this reduced form is not uniquely determined by the game.

Given an equilibrium y , let P^y be the joint distribution of $(y(T), T)$, where $y(T) = (y_i(T_i))_{i=1}^N$, when the distribution of T is equal to P . Also given y , let $Q^y = (Q_1^y, \dots, Q_N^y)$, where Q_i^y is the joint distribution of $(y(T), T)$ according to player i 's beliefs about T . Under both P^y and Q^y , Y_i and Y_j are conditionally independent given C . Since the type distributions and beliefs are all heterogeneous, the distributions of Y_i 's are not necessarily identical, even if we focus on a symmetric equilibrium.

2.2. Examples.

2.2.1. Large Games with Social Interactions. Suppose that we have disjoint S groups of players where each group s has N_s number of players, and denote $\mathbb{N}_s$ to be group s . Each group s constitutes a large game with private information. For player i in group s , we follow Brock and Durlauf (2001b) (see (4) and (5) there) and consider either of the following two

⁷Existence of a pure strategy equilibrium can be established by invoking a more special structure of the game in application. For example, see Milgrom and Weber (1985), Athey (2001), McAdams (2003) and Reny (2011) and references therein for general results.

⁸To see how higher order beliefs are accommodated, first we follow Harsanyi (1967-1968) to extend the type space to include the space of beliefs and higher order beliefs, that is, extend $\mathbb{T}^N$ to $(\mathbb{T}^N, \mathbb{B})$, where $\mathbb{B}$ denotes the set of beliefs and higher order beliefs. (Possibility of such an extension in most generality is affirmed by Mertens and Zamir (1985).) Define a pure strategy Bayesian Nash equilibrium in the game with an extended type space, say, $\tilde{y}(t, b)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{T}^N$ and $b \in \mathbb{B}$. Then the pure strategy equilibrium y in this paper's set-up can be viewed as $y(t) = \tilde{y}(t, b^*)$, for a given set of beliefs or higher order beliefs $b^* \in \mathbb{B}$. One of the main theses of this paper is to develop an econometric inference procedure that does not require knowledge of (and hence is robust against) b^* , as long as the eventual beliefs Q_i over the payoff types T_i 's (consistent with b^*) satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2.

specifications of payoff functions:

$$(2.3) \quad u_i(a_i, a_{-i}; t_i) = v_1(a_i; t_i) + v_2(a_i; t_i) \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} w_{j,s} a_j,$$

or

$$(2.4) \quad u_i(a_i, a_{-i}; t_i) = v_1(a_i; t_i) - \frac{v_2(t_i)}{2} \cdot \left(a_i - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} w_{j,s} a_j \right)^2,$$

where $v_1(a_i; t_i)$ is a component depending only on (a_i, t_i) , and $w_{j,s} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} w_{j,s} = 1$. The first specification expresses interaction between player i 's action (a_i) and the average actions of the other players. The second specification captures preference for conformity to the average actions of the other players.

2.2.2. A Large Game with Multiple Overlapping Reference Groups. Suppose that the game is a large private information game with multiple overlapping information groups $\mathbb{N}_s$ with $s = 1, \dots, S$. The information groups are reference groups such that the average of the actions by players in each group affects the payoff of the players in the group. More specifically, the payoff function takes the following form

$$u_i(a_i, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_i(a_i; T_i) + \frac{a_i \theta}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \left(\frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} a_j \right),$$

where $\mathbb{S}_i \subset \mathbb{S}$ denotes the set of the indices of the reference groups that player i belongs to. Each group s may represent social groups. The within-group correlation among the types T_i is permitted through the public signal C_s . More importantly the reference groups are allowed to be overlapping, so that each player i may belong to multiple reference groups simultaneously and yet differently from many other players.

For simplicity of exposition, we focus on the case with binary action space $\mathbb{A} = \{0, 1\}$ for the rest of the paper. The general case of a multinomial action set is dealt with in the appendix.

3. BELIEF-FREE HINDSIGHT REGRETS

In this section, we introduce the notion of hindsight regrets and establish its belief-free version. This version is used later to derive testable implications from the large game model. First, we rewrite the equilibrium constraints in (2.1) as follows: for given equilibrium y , for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{E}_i^y [u_i(Y_i; T_i) - u_i(\bar{a}, Y_{-i}; T_i) | T_i = t_i] \geq 0,$$

where $\mathbf{E}_i^y[\cdot | T_i = t_i]$ is conditional expectation (under Q_i^y) given $T_i = t_i$. Such constraints are generally useful for deriving moment inequalities for inference. However, they cannot be directly used here, due to the heterogeneous subjective beliefs of the players.

The hindsight regret approach of this paper replaces the inequality in (3.1) by the following *ex post* version:

$$(3.2) \quad u_i(Y; T_i) - u_i(\bar{a}, Y_{-i}; T_i) \geq -\lambda,$$

which is ensured to hold with large probability according to player i 's belief Q_i^y , by choosing a compensation scheme $\lambda \geq 0$ appropriately. The compensation λ prevents player i from switching from her action Y_i in equilibrium to action $\bar{a}$ (with large probability) after the types of all the players are revealed to her.

For use in econometric inference, we seek to find a minimal compensation scheme that does not rely on beliefs of the players (except through already given equilibrium y .) As we will see later, the quality of prediction and the econometrician's inference improves with the use of a tighter compensation scheme.

3.1. Strategic Interdependence among the Players. A player's hindsight regret measures *ex post* loss of payoff due to not being able to observe the types of other players. The notion of hindsight regret is directly related to strategic interdependence among the players. To formally introduce measure of strategic interdependence, we first define a maximal variation of a real function. Suppose that $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is a real-valued function on a set $\mathcal{X}^N \subset \mathbf{R}^N$. Then, we write

$$V_j(f) = \sup |f(x) - f(x_j(x))|,$$

where the supremum is over all x 's in $\mathcal{X}^N$ and over all $x_j(x)$'s in $\mathcal{X}^N$ such that $x_j(x)$ is x except for its j -th entry replaced by a certain element in $\mathcal{X}$. We call $V_j(f)$ a *maximal variation of f at the j -th coordinate*. For example, when $N = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(f) &= \sup_{(x_1, x_2, x) \in \mathcal{X}^3} |f(x_1, x) - f(x_2, x)| \text{ and} \\ V_2(f) &= \sup_{(x_1, x_2, x) \in \mathcal{X}^3} |f(x, x_1) - f(x, x_2)|. \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that we focus on a binary action set, i.e., $\mathbb{A} \equiv \{0, 1\}$. See the appendix for a general case of a finite action set.) For $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ as

$$(3.3) \quad \Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i)) \equiv V_j(u_i^\Delta(\cdot; t_i)),$$

where

$$u_i^\Delta(a_{-i}; t_i, y_i(t_i)) \equiv u_i(y_i(t_i), a_{-i}; t_i) - u_i(1 - y_i(t_i), a_{-i}; t_i).$$

For each player i , $\Delta_{ij}(t_i, y_i(t_i))$ measures the largest variation in player i 's payoff differential u_i^Δ between actions 1 and 0 which can be caused by player j 's arbitrary choice of an action. Hence $\Delta_{ij}(t_i, y_i(t_i))$ summarizes strategic relevance of player j to player i , and is used to formulate belief-free hindsight regrets later.

3.2. Belief-Free Hindsight Regrets for Large Games. Given an equilibrium y , player $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and small number $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we say that a nonnegative, $\mathbf{R}$ -valued map $\lambda_{i,\rho}(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{T}$ is a ρ -hindsight regret for player i , if

$$Q_i^y \{u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) \geq -\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i) | T_i\} \geq 1 - \rho, \text{ everywhere.}$$

A ρ -hindsight regret $\lambda_{i,\rho}$ for player i represents the vector of the amounts of compensations to induce her to maintain her strategy in equilibrium y with high probability at least $1 - \rho$.

By definition, if $\lambda_{i,\rho}$ is ρ -hindsight regret, any map $g_{i,\rho} \geq \lambda_{i,\rho}$ is also ρ -hindsight regret. We need to find a belief-free version of ρ -hindsight regret that is tight enough for use by the econometrician. To characterize a belief-free hindsight regret, we let

$$(3.4) \quad \lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i) \equiv \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2} \Lambda_i(t_i) \cdot \log \rho},$$

where

$$\Lambda_i(t_i) \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}; j \neq i} \Delta_{ij}^2(t_i; y_i(t_i)).$$

The quantity $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ is *belief free* in the sense that it does not depend on the subjective beliefs Q_i , other than through the given pure strategy equilibrium. Furthermore, $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ is a ρ -hindsight regret, as formalized in the following theorem.

THEOREM 1: *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Then for each pure strategy equilibrium y , each $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda_{i,\rho}(\cdot)$ is a ρ -hindsight regret.*

Furthermore, suppose that Assumption 2 holds with $\rho > 0$. Then,

$$(3.5) \quad P^y \{u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) \geq -\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i) | T_i\} \geq 1 - \rho.$$

The function $\Lambda_i(t_i)$ in (3.4) measures the overall strategic relevance of the other players to player i . Therefore, the hindsight regret increases with the strategic interdependence among the players. This is intuitive; player i 's *ex post* payoff loss due to not being able to observe the types of other players is large when actions by the other players can have a large impact on player i 's payoff.

Let us see how $\lambda_{i,\rho}$ defined in (3.4) becomes a ρ -hindsight regret. For any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.6) \quad & Q_i^y \{u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) \leq -\lambda | T_i = t_i\} \\
 & \leq Q_i^y \{u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) - \mathbf{E}_i^y [u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) | T_i] \leq -\lambda | T_i = t_i\} \\
 & \leq \exp(-2\lambda^2 / \Lambda_i(t_i)).
 \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows because $\mathbf{E}_i^y [u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) | T_i] \geq 0$ by the Nash equilibrium constraint, and the second inequality follows from McDiarmid's inequality (McDiarmid (1989)). Setting the last bound in (3.6) as ρ , we obtain the solution $\lambda = \lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (3.4). The inequality (3.5) is an immediate consequence of this combined with Assumption 2. Later we use (3.5) to obtain testable implications.

3.3. Examples Revisited.

3.3.1. Large Games with Social Interactions. As for the belief-free hindsight regrets, we first consider that in both cases of (2.3),

$$(3.7) \quad u_i^\Delta(a_{-i}; t_i) = v_1^\Delta(t_i) + v_2^\Delta(t_i) \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} w_{j,s} a_j,$$

where in the specification (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
 v_1^\Delta(t_i) &= v_1(1; t_i) - v_1(0; t_i), \text{ and} \\
 v_2^\Delta(t_i) &= v_2(1; t_i) - v_2(0; t_i),
 \end{aligned}$$

and in the specification of (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
 v_1^\Delta(t_i) &= v_1(1; t_i) - v_1(0; t_i) - v_2(t_i)/2, \text{ and} \\
 v_2^\Delta(t_i) &= v_2(t_i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Also, in both cases, $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i)) = w_{j,s} |v_2^\Delta(t_i)|$ for all $j \neq i$, and using this, we define $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (3.4). In particular, when $w_{j,s} = 1/(N_s - 1)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$, we have

$$(3.8) \quad \lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i) = \frac{|v_2^\Delta(t_i)|}{\sqrt{N_s - 1}} \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2} \log \rho}.$$

The hindsight regret is heterogeneous across information groups, depending on the number of the players N_s in each information group s . The more the players in a group, the smaller the hindsight regret for the group.

3.3.2. *A Large Game with Multiple Overlapping Reference Groups.* From the payoff specification, we observe that for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i)) = \frac{|\theta|}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1},$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Only those players who belong to at least one of player i 's reference groups are strategically relevant to player i . Using this, we construct $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as the following form:

$$|\theta| \sqrt{-\frac{\log \rho}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i\}} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1} \right)^2}.$$

Those players with large reference groups tend to have negligible hindsight regrets.

4. THE ECONOMETRICIAN'S OBSERVATIONS AND TESTABLE IMPLICATIONS

4.1. **The Econometrician's Observations.** We assume that the econometrician observes (Y, X) , where $Y \in \mathbb{A}^N$ is an N -dimensional vector of actions by N players and X is an $N \times d_X$ matrix whose i -th row is $X_i^\top$, where X_i is a subvector of T_i , and represents an observed covariate vector of player i .

ASSUMPTION 3 (THE ECONOMETRICIAN'S OBSERVATION): (i) The distribution of (Y, T) is equal to P^y associated with a pure strategy equilibrium y .

(ii) For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_i = (\eta_i, X_i)$, where $X_i \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}$ is observed but $\eta_i \in \mathbb{H} \subset \mathbf{R}^{d_\eta}$ is not observed by the econometrician.

(iii) For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, η_i is conditionally independent of C given X_i .

The distribution of (Y, T) that the econometrician focuses on stems from the Nature's objective probability P and a pure strategy equilibrium y . When there are multiple equilibria, the econometrician does not know which equilibrium the vector of observed outcomes Y is associated with. The players' subjective beliefs affect the distribution of (Y, T) through their impact on the associated equilibrium y .

Assumption 3(ii) specifies that T_i involves components η_i and X_i which are unobserved and observed by the econometrician respectively. Thus the econometrician may not observe part of the type information each player has.

To appreciate Assumption 3(iii), for each $s = 1, \dots, S$, let the set $\mathbb{N}_s \subset \mathbb{N}$ denote the collection of i 's such that all the players in $\mathbb{N}_s$ belong to reference group s . Suppose further that

$$(4.1) \quad \eta_i = \varphi_s(\tilde{\eta}_i, U_s) \text{ and } X_i = (\tilde{X}_i, Z_s),$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_i$ is an unobserved idiosyncratic component, U_s is an unobserved group-specific component, $\tilde{X}_i$ and Z_s are observed idiosyncratic and group-specific components, and φ_s is an unobserved nonstochastic map. Furthermore, we specify that

$$(4.2) \quad C_s = (U_s, Z_s) \text{ and } U_s = h_s(Z_s),$$

where h_s is a nonstochastic function unknown to the econometrician. We assume that $(\tilde{\eta}_i, \tilde{X}_i)$'s are conditionally independent (across i 's) given $C = (C_s)_{s=1}^S$, so that Assumption 1 may hold. The unobserved group specific characteristics U_s are incorporated in the unobserved heterogeneity η_i , and are sources of their within-group correlation. Now Assumption 3(iii) requires that this within-group correlation among the unobserved components η_i is fully controlled by the observed group characteristics part of X_i . This condition is satisfied, for example, if U_s is an unknown function of Z_s , as in (4.2). Hence Assumption 3 allows for unobserved group characteristics in a limited way.⁹

We introduce parametrization of unobserved heterogeneity η_i and payoffs.

ASSUMPTION 4 (PARAMETRIZATION OF UNOBSERVED HETEROGENEITY AND PAYOFFS):
For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$, and $a \in \mathbb{A}^N$,

$$P \{ \eta_i \leq t_i | X_i \} = G_{\theta_0}(t_i | X_i) \text{ and } u_i(a; t_i) = u_{i, \theta_0}(a; t_i),$$

where $\theta_0 \in \Theta \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, and $G_\theta(\cdot | X_i)$ and $u_{i, \theta}(\cdot; t_i)$ are parametrized by $\theta \in \Theta$.

Assumption 4 assumes that the conditional CDF of η_i given X_i and the payoff function are parametrized by a finite dimensional vector $\theta \in \Theta$. A notable feature of the assumption is that while η_i is allowed to involve unobserved group characteristic U_s , the econometrician does not need to specify parametrically the way U_s in (4.1) is related to X_i . More specifically, write

$$P \{ \eta_i \leq t_i | X_i \} = \int P \{ \eta_i \leq t_i | X_i, U_s = u_s \} dF(u_s | X_i),$$

where $F(\cdot | X_i)$ is the conditional CDF of U_s given X_i . One does not need to parametrically specify the conditional distribution of η_i given X_i and U_s or the conditional distribution of U_s given X_i . For this paper's method, it suffices to parametrically specify the conditional distribution of η_i given X_i .

It is worth noting that Assumptions 3-4 are concerned only with the primitives of the game. They do not impose restrictions on the equilibrium y or the way the agents' beliefs are formed in equilibrium. The assumptions are only concerned with the Nature's objective probability P .

⁹See Brock and Durlauf (2007) for partial identification results for discrete-choice based social interactions models with unobserved group specific characteristics.

4.2. Testable Implications from Belief-Free Hindsight Regrets. We derive testable implications by using Theorem 1. For simplicity, we write $u_i^\Delta(\bar{a}) = u_{i,\theta_0}(\bar{a}, Y_{-i}; T_i) - u_{i,\theta_0}(1 - \bar{a}, Y_{-i}; T_i)$, $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$, suppressing Y_{-i} and T_i and θ_0 from the notation.

Since $Y = y(T)$ for some pure strategy Nash equilibrium y , for all values of T_i such that $Y_i = 1$, we have $\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta|T_i] \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$(4.3) \quad 1 \{Y_i = 1\} \leq 1 \{\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta(1)|T_i] \geq 0\}.$$

Similarly, for all values of T_i such that $Y_i \neq 1$, we have $Y_i = 0$ so that $\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta|T_i] \leq 0$. In other words, we have

$$(4.4) \quad 1 \{Y_i \neq 1\} \leq 1 \{\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta(1)|T_i] \leq 0\}.$$

We take conditional expectations (given X_i) of both sides in (4.3) and (4.4), and deduce that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(4.5) \quad 1 - \pi_{i,L}^* \leq P \{Y_i = 1|X_i\} \leq \pi_{i,U}^*,$$

where $\pi_{i,U}^* \equiv P \{\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta(1)|T_i] \geq 0|X_i\}$ and $\pi_{i,L}^* \equiv P \{\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta(1)|T_i] \leq 0|X_i\}$.

Unfortunately, the inequalities in (4.5) cannot be directly used in our set-up for inference for two reasons. First, the bounds involve heterogeneous subjective beliefs which the econometrician has difficulty recovering from the observations. Second, the probabilities in both bounds of (4.5) cannot be simulated, because the bounds depend on the unknown distribution of Y_{-i} which is a nonprimitive quantity. We use Theorem 1 to address both issues.

First let $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i, \bar{a})$, $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$, denote $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ except that $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ in its definition is replaced by $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; \bar{a})$. Define

$$(4.6) \quad \gamma_i(\bar{a}) \equiv 1 \{u_i^\Delta(\bar{a}) \geq -\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i, \bar{a})\}$$

and

$$H_{i,U} \equiv \{\eta_i \in \mathbb{H} : \gamma_i(1) = 1\} \text{ and } H_{i,L} \equiv \{\eta_i \in \mathbb{H} : \gamma_i(0) = 1\}.$$

Using this, we construct probabilities:

$$(4.7) \quad \pi_{i,U} \equiv P \{\eta_i \in H_{i,U}|X_i, Y_{-i}\} \text{ and } \pi_{i,L} \equiv P \{\eta_i \in H_{i,L}|X_i, Y_{-i}\}.$$

Unlike $\pi_{i,U}^*$ and $\pi_{i,L}^*$, these probabilities can be simulated, as explained at the end of this subsection.

We define

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} e_{i,L} &\equiv P\{Y_i = 1|X_i\} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i} \cdot \pi_{i,L}\right) \text{ and} \\ e_{i,U} &\equiv P\{Y_i = 1|X_i\} - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i} \cdot \pi_{i,U}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_i \equiv \rho 1\{\max_{t_i \in \mathbb{T}} \lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i, 1) > 0\}$.

To construct testable implications, we choose a vector of nonnegative functions $\mathbf{g}_i = (g_{i1}, \dots, g_{iL})^\top : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)^L$. One may conjecture moment inequalities in a spirit similar to Andrews and Shi (2013) as follows:

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,L} \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) \geq 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,U} \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) \leq 0.$$

However, Theorem 1 does not imply the inequalities in (4.9), because we are using $\pi_{i,U}$ and $\pi_{i,L}$ in (4.8) instead of

$$(4.10) \quad P\{\eta_i \in H_{i,U}|X_i\} \text{ and } P\{\eta_i \in H_{i,L}|X_i\}.$$

We introduce $\mathbf{w}_L, \mathbf{w}_U \in \mathbf{R}_+^L$, and define the event that the moment inequalities hold:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_U, \mathbf{w}_L) \equiv \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,L} \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) + \mathbf{w}_L \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,U} \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) - \mathbf{w}_U \leq 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

It remains to find good bounds $\mathbf{w}_L$ and $\mathbf{w}_U$ such that the probability of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_U, \mathbf{w}_L)$ becomes sufficiently large, so that the moment inequalities serve as testable implications from Theorem 1.

THEOREM 2: *Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 hold. Then for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$,*

$$(4.11) \quad P[\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X))|X] \geq 1 - \frac{\tau}{2} (1\{\delta_U(X) > 0\} + 1\{\delta_L(X) > 0\}),$$

almost everywhere, where $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$, $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$, $\delta_U(X)$ and $\delta_L(X)$ are as defined in (4.14) below.

To define $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$, $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$, $\delta_U(X)$ and $\delta_L(X)$, we first note that $\pi_{i,L}$ and $\pi_{i,U}$ are non-stochastic functions of (Y_{-i}, X_i) from (4.7). We make explicit the dependence by writing $\pi_{i,L}$ and $\pi_{i,U}$ as $\pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i)$ and $\pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i)$. Define

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} d_{jl,L} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i)) g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i} \text{ and} \\ d_{jl,U} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i)) g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i))$ and $V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i))$ are maximal variations of $\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i)$ and $\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i)$ along the coordinate j . These variations determine the maximal approximation error due to the use of $\pi_{i,U}$ and $\pi_{i,L}$ instead of the conditional probabilities in (4.10). We let $\mathbf{d}_{L,j}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{U,j}$ be L dimensional column vectors whose entries are given by $d_{jl,L}$ and $d_{jl,U}$, with $l = 1, \dots, L$ keeping the same order as in the construction of $e_{i,L}\mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$. Then define $L \times L$ matrices:

$$(4.13) \quad \tilde{D}_L(X) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{d}_{L,j} \mathbf{d}_{L,j}^\top \text{ and } \tilde{D}_U(X) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{d}_{U,j} \mathbf{d}_{U,j}^\top.$$

Let $D_L(X)$ and $D_U(X)$ be the same as $\tilde{D}_L(X)$ and $\tilde{D}_U(X)$ except that the zero entries are replaced by a small number $\eta > 0$. Define for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$,

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X) &\equiv \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2\delta_L(X)} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right)} D_L(X) \mathbf{r}_L(X), \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) &\equiv \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2\delta_U(X)} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right)} D_U(X) \mathbf{r}_U(X), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_L(X)$ and $\delta_U(X)$ are Perron-Frobenius eigenvalues of $D_L(X)$ and $D_U(X)$ and $\mathbf{r}_L(X)$ and $\mathbf{r}_U(X)$ are associated nonnegative eigenvectors (normalized to have the Euclidean norm 1).¹⁰ As we parametrize the payoff function and the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity (Assumption 4), we can often derive the explicit form of the matrices $\tilde{D}_L(X)$ and $\tilde{D}_U(X)$. This is explained in detail in the supplemental note to this paper.

Let us consider the simulation of $\pi_{i,U}$ and $\pi_{i,L}$. By Assumptions 3-4, we can rewrite

$$(4.15) \quad \pi_{i,U} \equiv \int_{H_{i,U}} dG_\theta(\eta_i | X_i) \text{ and } \pi_{i,L} \equiv \int_{H_{i,L}} dG_\theta(\eta_i | X_i).$$

The integrals can be either evaluated explicitly, or simulated by drawing η_i from $G_\theta(\cdot | X_i)$. For example, consider the payoff differential for each player i :

$$u_i(1, a_{-i}; T_i) - u_i(0, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_{1,i} + \frac{v_{2,i}}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} a_j - \eta_i,$$

¹⁰The small number $\eta > 0$ in the definition of $D_L(X)$ and $D_U(X)$ is introduced to make sure that the matrices are irreducible, so that by Perron-Frobenius Theorem (e.g. Theorem 8.2 of Serre (2010), p.151) positive eigenvalues $\delta_L(X)$ and $\delta_U(X)$ and positive eigenvectors $\mathbf{r}_L(X)$ and $\mathbf{r}_U(X)$ exist. In practice, one may take any nominally positive number such as 10^{-16} , depending on the machine precision. Any fixed choice of $\eta > 0$ does not affect the validity of the results in this paper. A matlab program that computes the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and eigenvector for an irreducible matrix is available on the Mathworks website.

where $N_s = |\mathbb{N}_s|$, $v_{1,i} \equiv v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i)$, and $v_{2,i} \equiv v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i)$, for some parametric functions v_{1,θ_1} , and v_{2,θ_2} . Then, for $i \in \mathbb{N}_s$,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{i,U} &= G_\theta \left(v_{1,i} + \frac{v_{2,i}}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_j + \lambda_{i,\rho} |X_i| \right) \text{ and} \\ \pi_{i,L} &= 1 - G_\theta \left(v_{1,i} + \frac{v_{2,i}}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_j - \lambda_{i,\rho} |X_i| \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{i,\rho}$ is a belief-free hindsight regret given by

$$\lambda_{i,\rho} = \frac{|v_{2,i}|}{\sqrt{N_s - 1}} \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2} \log \rho}$$

as in (3.8). Hence there is no need to resort to simulations in this case. From the explicit form of $\pi_{i,U}$ and $\pi_{i,L}$, we can derive $d_{il,U}$ and $d_{il,L}$ explicitly. See the supplemental note for details.

In general, the inequality restrictions in (4.11) become weaker, when $\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i, \bar{a})$ is larger, i.e., the strategic relevance of the players among each other is stronger. This is a cost to the econometrician for not being able to recover fully the beliefs of individual players despite strong strategic interactions among them.

5. BOOTSTRAP INFERENCE AND ASYMPTOTIC VALIDITY

For inference, we compare the actual actions of the players and their predicted actions conditional on X . We pursue an inference procedure that is robust to any type distribution P chosen for the Nature's experiment and any configurations of subjective beliefs (within the boundary set by Assumptions 1-2), and any pure strategy equilibrium among multiple equilibria. To make the notion of robustness precise, we let $\mathcal{P}_0$ be the collection of type distributions P chosen by the Nature such that they satisfy Assumptions 1-4. We let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the collection of all the subjective belief profiles $Q = (Q_1, \dots, Q_N)$ such that each Q_i satisfies Assumptions 1-2. For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, let $\mathcal{Y}_Q$ be the set of pure strategy equilibria associated with a given subjective belief Q . Then the set $\mathcal{Y} \equiv \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{Y}_Q$ includes any pure strategy equilibrium associated with any belief profile Q in $\mathcal{Q}$. We let $\mathcal{P}$ be the collection of the joint distributions of (Y, X) , with $Y = y(T)$, as the distribution P of $T = (\eta, X)$ runs in $\mathcal{P}_0$ and y runs in $\mathcal{Y}$. We search for an inference procedure that is *robust* against any choice of distributions in $\mathcal{P}$ for (Y, X) .

We define

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} r_{i,L}(\theta) &\equiv 1\{Y_i = 1\} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i} \cdot \pi_{i,L}\right) \text{ and} \\ r_{i,U}(\theta) &\equiv 1\{Y_i = 1\} - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i} \cdot \pi_{i,U}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we define

$$(5.2) \quad \mathbf{l}_U(\theta) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_{i,U}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) \text{ and } \mathbf{l}_L(\theta) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_{i,L}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i).$$

Using $\mathbf{l}_U(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{l}_L(\theta)$, we take the following as our test statistic:

$$(5.3) \quad T(\theta) = N \left\| [\mathbf{l}_U(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)]_+ + [\mathbf{l}_L(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)]_- \right\|^2,$$

where for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^\top \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $[\mathbf{x}]_+ = [\max\{x_j, 0\}]_{j=1}^d$ and $[\mathbf{x}]_- = [\max\{-x_j, 0\}]_{j=1}^d$.

Although the test statistic takes a similar form as in many researches in the literature of moment inequalities (e.g. Rosen (2008), Andrews and Soares (2010), and Andrews and Shi (2013) among others), the sample moments $\mathbf{l}_U(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{l}_L(\theta)$ here are not necessarily the sum of independent or conditionally independent random variables. The summands $r_{i,U}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$ and $r_{i,L}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$ involve Y_{-i} , and are dependent across i 's in a complicated manner.

We use Theorem 2 to deal with this issue. First, we write

$$(5.4) \quad \mathbf{l}_U(\theta) = \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,U} \mathbf{g}_i(X_i),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^* \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$ and $r_i^* \equiv 1\{Y_i = 1\} - P\{Y_i = 1|X_i\}$. Writing $\mathbf{l}_L(\theta)$ similarly and applying Theorem 2, we deduce that with probability at least $1 - \tau$,

$$(5.5) \quad [\mathbf{l}_U(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)]_+ + [\mathbf{l}_L(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)]_- \leq [\boldsymbol{\zeta}]_+ + [\boldsymbol{\zeta}]_- = |\boldsymbol{\zeta}|,$$

where for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^\top \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $|\mathbf{x}| = (|x_1|, \dots, |x_d|)^\top$.

We base the inference on the asymptotic distribution of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$. Using Assumption 1, one can show that $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ is the sum of martingale difference arrays. Under some regularity conditions, the martingale central limit theorem gives us the following: as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(5.6) \quad \sqrt{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta} \xrightarrow{D} V^{1/2} \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ is a random vector distributed as $N(0, I)$ and $V^{1/2}$ is a positive definite random matrix independent of $\mathbb{Z}$.

It remains to obtain an approximate distribution of $V^{1/2} \mathbb{Z}$ that we can use for actual inference. Asymptotic inference involving martingale difference arrays typically adopts random norming to pivotize the test statistic. However, this is not possible in our case for two

reasons. First, the matrix $V^{1/2}$ involves $P\{Y_i = 1|X_i = \cdot\}$'s which are heterogeneous across i 's. Second, the test is on multiple inequality restrictions rather than equality restrictions. Thus, we cannot pivotize the test, for example, by using an inverse covariance matrix.

To deal with this situation, we first propose a benchmark method of constructing bootstrap critical values that are asymptotically valid, computationally efficient, and yet conservative. Then we turn to the case of asymptotically negligible hindsight regrets, and develop a way to improve the inference at the cost of additional computational cost.

5.1. Benchmark Bootstrap. We first draw $\varepsilon_{i,b}$'s with $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $b = 1, \dots, B$, from $N(0, 1)$ independently and identically distributed across i 's, and b 's. Consider the following bootstrap test statistic:

$$T_b^* \equiv \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Z}_i \varepsilon_{i,b} \right\|^2, \quad b = 1, \dots, B,$$

where $\hat{Z}_i$ is a column vector with entries

$$\hat{Z}_{il} \equiv 1\{Y_i = 1\}g_{il}(X_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N 1\{Y_k = 1\}g_{kl}(X_k), \quad l = 1, \dots, L$$

Let $c_{1-\alpha,B}^*$ be the $(1-\alpha+\tau(\theta))$ -th percentile of the bootstrap test statistics T_b^* , $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, where

$$(5.7) \quad \tau(\theta) = \frac{\tau}{2} (1 \{ \bar{\delta}_U(\theta) > 0 \} + 1 \{ \bar{\delta}_L(\theta) > 0 \}),$$

$\bar{\delta}_U(\theta) = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}} \delta_U(x)$, and $\bar{\delta}_L(\theta) = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}} \delta_L(x)$. The confidence set for $\theta \in \Theta$ is defined to be

$$(5.8) \quad \mathcal{C}_B = \{ \theta \in \Theta : T(\theta) \leq \max\{c_{1-\alpha,B}^*, \varepsilon\} \},$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a fixed small number such as 0.001. The maximum with $\varepsilon > 0$ in the critical value in $\mathcal{C}_B$ is introduced to ensure the uniform validity of the bootstrap confidence set even when the test statistic becomes degenerate. Conveniently, the critical value $c_{1-\alpha,B}^*$ depends on $\theta \in \Theta$ only through $\tau(\theta)$, not through the bootstrap test statistic T_b^* . This expedites the computation of the confidence set substantially. The following theorem shows that the bootstrap procedure is uniformly asymptotically valid.

THEOREM 3: *Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 hold and that there exists a constant $C_g > 0$ such that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq l \leq L} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}} |g_{il}(x)| \leq C_g$. Then*

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \{ \theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty \} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

The condition that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}} |g_{il}(x)| \leq C_g$ can be relaxed to include unbounded g_{il} 's. (See Theorem A3 in the appendix.)

To see the intuition of why the bootstrap method works, first note that for each $\theta \in \Theta$, the distribution of $T(\theta)$ is first order stochastically dominated by that of

$$(5.9) \quad N \|\zeta_+ + \zeta_-\|^2 = N \|\zeta\|^2,$$

by (5.5). By comparing the variances, one can show that the asymptotic distribution of the last quantity is again first order stochastically dominated by the asymptotic distribution of

$$(5.10) \quad \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \right\|^2,$$

where Z_i is an $L \times 1$ column vector whose entries are

$$Z_{ij} \equiv 1\{Y_i = 1\}g_{il}(X_i) - \mathbf{E}[1\{Y_i = 1\}g_{il}(X_i)|\mathcal{F}], \quad l = 1, \dots, L,$$

and $\mathcal{F}$ is a certain sigma field contained in that of (X, C) . The distribution of the last sum is approximated by the conditional distribution of T_b^* given (Y, X) when N and B are sufficiently large. Since

$$P\{T_b^* > \max\{c_{1-\alpha, B}^*, \varepsilon\} | Y, X\} \leq \alpha,$$

by the definition of $c_{1-\alpha, B}^*$, we also have

$$P\{T(\theta) > \max\{c_{1-\alpha, B}^*, \varepsilon\} | \mathcal{F}\} \lesssim \alpha,$$

where $\lesssim$ denotes inequality that holds in the limit. Hence taking the expectation on both sides, we find that the bootstrap test is asymptotically valid.

The observations are cross-sectionally dependent due to the public signals C_s . Cameron, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) proposed a wild bootstrap procedure for regression models with clustered errors. It is worth comparing this paper's wild bootstrap procedure with theirs. Their wild bootstrap procedure requires that the simulated multipliers $\varepsilon_{i,b}$ be group-specific. We cannot apply their method here, because we do not require the number of the groups to grow to infinity as the sample size increases. In contrast, this paper's bootstrap procedure remains valid regardless of whether the number of the groups is small or large. This is due to our assumption that the within-group correlation is fully captured by the observed group specific variables. (Assumption 3(iii).) Cameron, Gelbach and Miller (2008) do not make such an assumption.

5.2. Modified Bootstrap. When the hindsight regrets are negligible for which we provide a precise condition below, we can obtain an improved inference method. We consider the

following bootstrap test statistic:

$$T_b^{Mod*}(\theta) \equiv N \left\| [\mathbf{I}_{U,b}^*(\theta)]_+ + [\mathbf{I}_{L,b}^*(\theta)]_- \right\|^2, \quad b = 1, \dots, B,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_{U,b}^*(\theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (r_{i,U}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b} \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{I}_{L,b}^*(\theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (r_{i,L}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b}. \end{aligned}$$

We take $c_{1-\alpha,B}^{Mod*}(\theta)$ to be the $(1 - \alpha + \tau(\theta))$ -th percentile of the bootstrap test statistics $T_b^{Mod*}(\theta)$, $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, and define the confidence set for $\theta \in \Theta$ to be

$$\mathcal{C}_B^{Mod} = \{ \theta \in \Theta : T(\theta) \leq \max\{c_{1-\alpha,B}^{Mod*}(\theta), \varepsilon\} \}.$$

The following theorem shows that the confidence set is asymptotically valid under appropriate conditions.

THEOREM 4: *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 3 hold and as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(5.11) \quad \max_{1 \leq l \leq L} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N (d_{jl,L}^2 + d_{jl,U}^2) | C \right] \rightarrow 0,$$

where $d_{jl,L}$'s and $d_{jl,U}$'s are as defined in (4.12). Then,

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \{ \theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty^{Mod} \} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

To see how this method achieves validity, let us assume for simplicity that $L = 1$. We write

$$(5.12) \quad \sqrt{N} \mathbf{I}_{U,b}^*(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N r_{i,U}(\theta) g_{i,1}(X_i) \varepsilon_{i,b}.$$

The conditional variance of the last term given (Y, X) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (r_i^* + e_{i,U})^2 g_{i,1}^2(X_i) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^{*2} g_{i,1}^2(X_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,U}^2 g_{i,1}^2(X_i),$$

for large N , where the cross-product terms can be shown to disappear when the hindsight regrets are asymptotically negligible. The leading sum in the last display is the conditional variance of $\sqrt{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta}$. Hence the conditional variance of $\sqrt{N} \mathbf{I}_{U,b}^*(\theta)$ is asymptotically larger than the conditional variance of $\sqrt{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta}$. Using a similar analysis for $\sqrt{N} \mathbf{I}_{L,b}^*(\theta)$, we find that the

bootstrap distribution of $\sqrt{N}\{[\mathbf{1}_{U,b}^*(\theta)]_+ + [\mathbf{1}_{L,b}^*(\theta)]_-\}$ first order stochastically dominates that of $\sqrt{N}|\boldsymbol{\zeta}|$, when N is large. Hence using $T_b^{Mod*}(\theta)$ yields a bootstrap critical value that is asymptotically valid.

Condition (5.11) summarizes what we eventually need through asymptotically negligible hindsight regrets. For example, consider a large game with social interactions with the equal weight $w_{j,s} = 1/(N_s - 1)$ in Section 2.3.2, and for simplicity assume that the distribution of X_i is concentrated on a bounded set, and that the payoff differential u_i^Δ is additive in η_i whose conditional CDF given X_i has a bounded density. Then we can show that

$$\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq L} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N (d_{jl,L}^2 + d_{jl,U}^2) g_{jk}^2(X_j) \right] = O(N^{-1}),$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, satisfying the condition in (5.11). Thus when the hindsight regrets are asymptotically negligible, the condition in (5.11) is met usually.

To see when this modified method achieves improvement, we note that

$$(5.13) \quad \sqrt{N}\mathbf{1}_{U,b}^*(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (r_{i,U}(\theta) \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b} = \sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}^* + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (e_{i,U} \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^* \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (r_i^* \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b}$. Suppose that the hindsight regrets turn out to be asymptotically negligible. In many examples, this means that the last sum is distributionally close to degenerate at zero.¹¹ Since the bootstrap distribution of $\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}^*$ approximates the distribution of $\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, and the last sum in (5.13) is small, we follow the same arguments for $\sqrt{N}\mathbf{1}_{L,b}^*(\theta)$ and find that the bootstrap distribution of $T_b^{Mod*}(\theta)$ approximates the distribution of $\|\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2$ which we noted previously is stochastically dominated by the bootstrap distribution of T_b^* . Therefore, the bootstrap distribution of $T_b^{Mod*}(\theta)$ is first order stochastically dominated by that of T_b^* , yielding a lower bootstrap critical value than that based on T_b^* . This is the potential source of power improvement.

In many situations, one needs to make inference about a subvector θ_1 of the parameter vector $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, where θ_2 denotes the nuisance parameter. Following what Bugni, Canay and Shi (2013) called the *recycling approach*, we may construct the bootstrap confidence set as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{1-\alpha,B,1}^{Mod} = \{\theta_1 \in \Theta_1 : T(\theta_1) \leq \max\{c_{1-\alpha,B}^{Mod*}(\theta_1), \varepsilon\}\},$$

¹¹For example, consider Example 2.2.1, where the hindsight regrets are asymptotically negligible as $N_s \rightarrow \infty$. (See Section 3.3.1.) Suppose that $w_{j,s} = 1/(N_s - 1)$ there and the probability of a tie in equilibrium is zero. Then $e_{i,U}$ is close to the difference between $P\{\mathbf{E}_i^y[u_i^\Delta(1)|T_i] \geq 0|X_i\}$ and $P\{u_i^\Delta(1) \geq -\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i)|Y_{-i}, X_i\}$. Since $\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i)$ is small and $u_i^\Delta(1)$ depends on Y_{-i} only through the within group proportion $\frac{1}{N_s-1} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_i$, this difference becomes negligible by Assumptions 1 and 2.

where $T(\theta_1) \equiv \inf_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} T(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and

$$c_{1-\alpha, B}^{Mod*}(\theta_1) \equiv \inf_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} c_{1-\alpha, B}^{Mod*}(\theta_1, \theta_2),$$

with $c_{1-\alpha, B}^{Mod*}(\theta)$ being constructed as before. See Bugni, Canay, and Shi (2013) for more details.

6. MONTE CARLO SIMULATION STUDIES

6.1. Basic Data Generating Processes. We consider S number of private information Bayesian games, where each game s is populated by N_s number of players. The action space for each player is $\{0, 1\}$. The i -th player in game $s = 1, \dots, S$ has the following form of a payoff differential:

$$(6.1) \quad u_i(1, a_{-i}; T_i) - u_i(0, a_{-i}; T_i) = X_{i,s}\beta_0 + \phi_0 \left(\frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N_s} a_j \right) + \eta_{i,s},$$

where $X_{i,s}$ and $\eta_{i,s}$ are observable and unobservable characteristics of player i . The payoff specification is often used in the literature of social interactions, where ϕ_0 measures the presence of social interactions. The payoff specification and private information assumption imply the following form of belief-free hindsight regret for player i in game s :

$$(6.2) \quad \lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i) = \sqrt{-\frac{\phi_0^2}{N_s - 1} \frac{\log \rho}{2}}.$$

In simulations, we specified

$$(6.3) \quad X_{i,s} = Z_{i,s} + \gamma_0 C_s - 0.2,$$

where $Z_{i,s}$ is an idiosyncratic component and C_s is a public signal that is specific to group s . The random variables $\eta_{i,s}$, $Z_{i,s}$, and C_s are drawn independently from $N(0, 1)$, and $Z_{i,s}$'s are independent across i 's and s 's and C_s 's are independent across s 's.

To generate outcomes in equilibrium, we draw c from the distribution of C_s , and find a solution for $p_s(c) = P\{Y_i = 1 | C_s = c\}$ for each value c from the equilibrium constraints and then generate $X_{i,s}(c) = Z_{i,s} + \gamma_0 c - 0.2$ and $Y_{i,s} = 1 \{X_{i,s}(c)\beta_0 + \phi_0 \cdot p_s(c) + \eta_{i,s} \geq 0\}$ by drawing $(Z_{i,s}, \eta_{i,s})$ from its specified distribution for $i \in \mathbb{N}_s$. For the simulations, we assume that each game has the same number of players (denoted by N_s .)

For the construction of moment inequalities, we used the following:

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(X_{i,s}) &= 1, \quad g_2(X_{i,s}) = |X_{i,s}|, \quad g_3(X_{i,s}) = 1\{X_{i,s} \geq 0\}, \text{ and} \\ g_4(X_{i,s}) &= |X_{i,s}| + 1\{X_{i,s} \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the simulation studies, we chose $\rho = 0.01$, $\tau = 0.01$, $\gamma_0 = 1/3$, and $\beta_0 = 1$. We set the Monte Carlo and bootstrap simulation numbers to be 1,000.

6.2. Finite Sample Coverage Probabilities of Bootstrap Tests. We first investigate the finite sample validity of the confidence intervals. For this study, we choose ϕ_0 from $\{0, 0.5\}$. Since the belief-free hindsight regret in (6.2) is increasing in ϕ_0 , we expect that as ϕ_0 moves away from zero, the hindsight regret becomes higher, sending the moment inequalities away from being binding, and ultimately the confidence set will become more conservative. The main interest here is to investigate how conservative the confidence set becomes in finite samples.

Table 1 reports finite sample coverage probabilities. The benchmark bootstrap confidence set gives conservative finite sample coverage probabilities even when $\phi_0 = 0$, i.e. there is no hindsight regret. This is because the stochastic dominance of $N\|\zeta\|^2$ in (5.9) by $\|N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i\|^2$ in (5.10) remains in force even in the absence of hindsight regret.

Table 1: Finite Sample Coverage Probabilities at 95%
(Small S Relative to Large N_s)

		Benchmark		Modified	
		$\phi_0 = 0.0$	$\phi_0 = 0.5$	$\phi_0 = 0.0$	$\phi_0 = 0.5$
$S = 10$	$N_s = 100$	1.000	1.000	0.948	1.000
	$N_s = 300$	1.000	1.000	0.943	1.000
$S = 50$	$N_s = 100$	1.000	1.000	0.951	1.000
	$N_s = 300$	1.000	1.000	0.955	1.000

Table 2: Finite Sample Coverage Probabilities at 95%
(Small N_s Relative to Large S)

		Benchmark		Modified	
		$\phi_0 = 0.0$	$\phi_0 = 0.5$	$\phi_0 = 0.0$	$\phi_0 = 0.5$
$S = 100$	$N_s = 30$	1.000	1.000	0.947	1.000
$S = 300$	$N_s = 30$	0.999	1.000	0.949	1.000

On the other hand, the confidence sets from the modified bootstrap exhibit nonconservative coverage probabilities. However, this modified method also becomes conservative as ϕ_0 moves away from zero, as we move further into the interior of the moment inequality restrictions.

The asymptotic justification for the modified bootstrap procedure requires that the hindsight regrets be asymptotically negligible. From the payoff specification, this asymptotic negligibility arises when N_s is large. Now we check if the performance changes when we consider small N_s relative to large S . We chose $S \in \{100, 300\}$ and $N_s = 30$. The results of Table 2 are similar to those of Table 1. Thus the validity of the bootstrap method is not much affected by whether we choose small N_s with large S or small S with large N_s , which echoes the fact that the asymptotic validity of the bootstrap test does not rely on a particular way the ratio S/N_s behaves in the limit, as long as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

One might think that when the hindsight regrets are asymptotically negligible, we may ignore the hindsight regrets altogether in constructing a test statistic. This is tantamount to assuming that the Bayesian Nash equilibrium that the econometrician observes is in fact an *ex post Nash equilibrium*, where the equilibrium strategies remain an equilibrium even after all the types are revealed to the players. However, when the equilibrium behind the observed outcomes is not necessarily an *ex post* Nash equilibrium, ignoring hindsight regrets can lead to invalid inference in general. (See Table 2 below.)¹²

Table 3: Finite Sample Coverage Probabilities at 90%
(Hindsight Regrets Ignored)


		Benchmark		Modified	
		$\phi_0 = -0.5$	$\phi_0 = -1.0$	$\phi_0 = -0.5$	$\phi_0 = -1.0$
$S = 10$	$N_s = 100$	0.992	0.985	0.882	0.837
	$N_s = 300$	0.984	0.877	0.874	0.827
$S = 50$	$N_s = 100$	0.990	0.977	0.868	0.814
	$N_s = 300$	0.995	0.877	0.985	0.839
$S = 100$	$N_s = 30$	0.997	0.977	0.876	0.825
	$S = 300$	0.995	0.977	0.879	0.842

Table 3 reports the finite sample coverage probabilities of the bootstrap tests when the hindsight regrets are entirely ignored in the construction of the test statistic. Here we set $\gamma_{0,1} = 0$ and $\beta_0 = 1$. The table shows that the finite sample coverage probabilities of the benchmark deteriorate when the hindsight regrets are ignored, as ϕ_0 becomes more negative, when S is small relative to N_s . The deterioration is substantially severe for the

¹²In this simulation design, the average partial effect (without considering the endogenous effect from equilibrium) on the conditional choice probability with respect to ϕ_0 is roughly around 0.135-0.137 (with $P\{Y_i = 1\}$ ranging from 0 to 1) when $\phi_0 = 0.5$, and around 0.235-0.273, when $\phi_0 = 1.0$.

modified bootstrap approach. Therefore, even when the hindsight regrets are asymptotically negligible, one cannot simply set it to be zero for valid inference in general.¹³

FIGURE 1. The False Coverage Probability of the Confidence Intervals for ϕ_0 at 95% with $S = 10$. The dotted line is from the benchmark bootstrap method and the solid line is from the modified bootstrap method. The recycling approach of Canay, Bugni and Shi (2013) was used for subvector inference. The x -axis represents the hypothesized value of ϕ . As ϕ is away from the true value, the hindsight regret tends to become larger, though not monotonously. When the within-group size N_s increases to 300, we observe conspicuous improvement by the modified bootstrap. Note that the confidence intervals (from the modified bootstrap) for ϕ_0 include 0 with close to zero probability when $\phi_0 = 0.5$ or 1. Also, note that the false coverage probability shows good performance when $\phi_0 = 0.5$ and $\phi_0 = 1.0$ and $N_s = 300$, despite the fact that the coverage probabilities were observed to be 1 in Tables 1-2.



¹³When we took ϕ_0 to be a positive number, the coverage probability deterioration did not arise.

6.3. Finite Sample Power of the Bootstrap Tests for Parameter Values. We saw that as ϕ_0 moves away from zero, the coverage probability tends to be very conservative. Now we investigate the finite sample power properties.

We first consider inference of ϕ_0 . The nominal coverage probability is set to be at 95%, and the number of the information groups are set to be 10. The subvector inference is based on the recycling approach of Canay, Bugni, and Shi (2013).

The results are shown in Figure 1. The x -axis represents the hypothesized value of ϕ under the null hypothesis. The upper row panels use the true value of $\phi_0 = 0.0, 0.5$, and 1.0 , with the group size $N_s = 100$. And the lower row panels use the same values of ϕ_0 , but with a larger group size $N_s = 300$.

From Figure 1, the bootstrap results show higher false coverage probability rates as ϕ_0 moves away from zero, and substantial improvement by the modified bootstrap procedure, and this improvement is further enhanced when N_s is increased from 100 to 300.


There are two notable features. First, when $\phi_0 = 0.5$ and $N_s = 300$, we saw that the coverage probabilities were equal to one in Tables 1-2, suggesting extreme conservativeness of the procedure. However, Figure 1 shows that even in this case, the false coverage probabilities are reasonably low as ϕ moves away from zero. This emphasizes the fact that the conservative coverage probabilities (or conservative size properties) do not necessarily imply trivial or weak power properties in finite samples.

Second, when ϕ_0 is either 0.5 or 1, the false coverage probability at value 0 is almost zero. This means that when ϕ_0 is away from zero, the confidence interval has almost zero probability of covering 0. As ϕ_0 is away from zero, the power of the bootstrap test (testing the null hypothesis of $\phi_0 = 0$) naturally increases, but the moment inequalities also become more conservative at the same time. Despite this conservativeness, the bootstrap test does not lose power to detect the deviation from the null hypothesis of $\phi_0 = 0$. This has a significant implication in empirical applications, because often we are interested in the presence of strategic interactions among the players, and $\phi_0 = 0$ in this context means absence of such interactions.

It is generally expected that the hindsight regret also affects the estimation of β_0 . Figure 2 shows the false coverage probabilities of confidence sets for β_0 . The results are similar. The modified bootstrap outperforms substantially the benchmark method. Increasing the group size N_s drastically improves the false coverage probability of the confidence sets.

We also investigated the situation where N_s is small relative to S . We chose $S = 300$ and $N_s = 30$. The results are shown in Figure 3. Unlike Figures 1-2, the false coverage probabilities do not drastically increase as ϕ_0 moves away from zero. Also, note that the false coverage probability at 0 value of ϕ_0 is almost zero when $\phi_0 = 0.5$, suggesting a good power to detect the violation of the null hypothesis $\phi_0 = 0$.


FIGURE 2. The False Coverage Probability of the Confidence Intervals for ϕ_0 at 95% with $S = 10$. The dotted line is from the benchmark bootstrap method and the solid line is from the modified bootstrap method. The recycling approach of Canay, Bugni and Shi (2013) was used for subvector inference. The x -axis represents the hypothesized value of ϕ . As ϕ is away from the true value, the hindsight regret tends to become larger, though not monotonously. When the within-group size N_s increases to 300, we observe conspicuous improvement by the modified bootstrap. Note that the confidence intervals (from the modified bootstrap) for ϕ_0 include 0 with close to zero probability when $\phi_0 = 0.5$ or 1. Also, note that the false coverage probability shows good performance when $\phi_0 = 0.5$ and $\phi_0 = 1.0$ and $N_s = 300$, despite the fact that the coverage probabilities were observed to be 1 in Tables 1-2.



7. CONCLUSION

This paper focuses on a large Bayesian game perspective for social interactions models, and develops an inference method that is robust to heterogeneous formation of beliefs among the players. Utilizing the strategic interdependence among the players and the assumption of

FIGURE 3. The False Coverage Probability of the Confidence Intervals for ϕ_0 and β_0 at 95% with $S = 300$ and $N_s = 30$. Unlike the case of small number of groups ($S = 10$) in Figures 1-2, increase in ϕ_0 does not drastically lead to an increase in the false coverage probability of confidence intervals for ϕ_0 and β_0 .



conditionally independent types, this paper derives testable implications from the equilibrium constraints.

The framework proposed in this paper may have limitations in some applications for several reasons. First, the framework assumes that the information groups are exogenously given in the beginning of the game. This does not cause any problem, if the current game's types satisfy the conditional independence assumption given any information used by the agents in the endogenous group formation that occurs prior to the game. However, this conditional independence assumption is violated when the agents observe the groups formed, before entering the current game. Second, the framework assumes that the idiosyncratic component of the types is not shared between two different players. This assumption excludes

a large network model where the information flow among the agents can be highly complex. Researches on both fronts require separate papers.

8. APPENDIX: EXTENSION TO MULTINOMIAL ACTION SETS

In this appendix, we show how the results of the main text can be extended to the case with a multinomial action set, i.e., $\mathbb{A} = \{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_K\}$. We extend the results in both the cases of ordered and unordered action sets. The specific forms of belief-free hindsight regrets and testable implications for various parametric specification of payoff functions are found in the supplemental note to this paper. The formal results in this appendix include Theorems 1-4 as special cases. To ease the comparison, the results here are labeled as Theorems A1-A4. The full proofs are found in the supplemental note to this paper.

8.1. Belief-Free Hindsight Regrets. First, we extend the measure of strategic interdependence. For $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{a}' \in \mathbb{A}$, and $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$, we define $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; \bar{a}')$ to be an $|\mathbb{A}| - 1$ dimensional column vector defined by

$$\Delta_{ij}(t_i; \bar{a}') \equiv [V_j(u_i^\Delta(\cdot; t_i, \bar{a}', \bar{a}))]_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}'\}},$$

where $u_i^\Delta(a_{-i}; t_i, \bar{a}', \bar{a})$ is player i 's payoff differential between choosing $\bar{a}'$ and $\bar{a}$, i.e.,

$$u_i^\Delta(a_{-i}; t_i, \bar{a}', \bar{a}) \equiv u_i(\bar{a}', a_{-i}; t_i) - u_i(\bar{a}, a_{-i}; t_i).$$

Let $\mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i)$ be an $(|\mathbb{A}| - 1) \times 1$ vector whose entries are given by $u_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i, \bar{a})$ with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{Y_i\}$. Given an equilibrium y , player $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and small number $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we say that a nonnegative, $\mathbf{R}^{|\mathbb{A}|-1}$ -valued map $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{T}$ is a ρ -hindsight regret for player i , if

$$Q_i^y \{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) \geq -\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(T_i) | T_i \} \geq 1 - \rho, \text{ everywhere.}$$

To characterize a belief-free hindsight regret, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, first define

$$(8.1) \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_i(t_i) \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}: j \neq i} \Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i)) \Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))^\top.$$

Then, we choose a small $\eta > 0$ and let $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(t_i)$ be the same as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_i(t_i)$ except that zero entries by replaced by η . All the entries of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(t_i)$ are strictly positive for all $t_i \in \mathbb{T}$, so that by Perron-Frobenius Theorem, there exist a unique Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and an associated eigenvector that has positive entries. We denote this eigenvector (normalized to have the Euclidean norm 1) and the eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(t_i)$ by $\mathbf{v}_i(t_i)$ and $\psi_i(t_i)$ respectively. We let

$$(8.2) \quad \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i) \equiv \sqrt{-\frac{\log \rho}{2\psi_i(t_i)}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(t_i) \mathbf{v}_i(t_i).$$

Then the following theorem confirms that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}$ is ρ -hindsight regret.

THEOREM A1: *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Then for each pure strategy equilibrium y , and each $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\cdot)$ is a ρ -hindsight regret.*

Furthermore, suppose that Assumption 2 holds with $\rho > 0$. Then,

$$P^y \left\{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) \geq -\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(T_i) | T_i \right\} \geq 1 - \rho.$$

Let us see how $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}$ becomes a ρ -hindsight regret. For any nonnegative vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}_+ \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}_+^{|\mathbb{A}|-1} : \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1\}$, and any $c > 0$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_i \left\{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) \leq -c\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(T_i)\mathbf{v} | T_i = t_i \right\} \\ & \leq Q_i \left\{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) - \mathbf{E}_i^y \left[\mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) | T_i \right] \leq -c\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(T_i)\mathbf{v} | T_i = t_i \right\} \\ & \leq \exp \left(-2c^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(t_i) \mathbf{v} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows by the Nash equilibrium constraint, and the second inequality by a multivariate extension of McDiarmid's inequality. (The multivariate extension is established in the supplemental note to this paper.) To obtain a tight lower bound, we minimize the last exponential bound over $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}_+$ to obtain

$$(8.3) \quad \exp \left(-2c^2 \psi_i(t_i) \right),$$

where $\psi_i(t_i)$ is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i(t_i)$ and the maximizer $\mathbf{v}_i(t_i) \in \mathbb{S}_+$ is taken to be the associated eigenvector with positive entries. We equate the last bound in (8.3) to ρ and solve the equation for c to obtain $c(t_i) = \sqrt{-(\log \rho)/(2\psi_i(t_i))}$. In other words, the exponential bound in (3.6) becomes ρ , if we take $c = c(t_i)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_i(t_i)$, and the desired form of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (8.2) follows.

8.2. Testable Implications. First let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i, \bar{a})$ denote $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ except that $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ is replaced by $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; \bar{a})$. Define also $u_i(\bar{a}) = u_i(\bar{a}, Y_{-i}; T_i)$. Define $\mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(\bar{a})$ to be the $(|\mathbb{A}| - 1) \times 1$ column vector whose entries are given by $u_i(\bar{a}) - u_i(c)$ with c running in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}\}$. Let

$$\gamma_i(\bar{a}) \equiv 1 \left\{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(\bar{a}) \geq -\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(T_i, \bar{a}) \right\}.$$

Using this, we construct probabilities that can be simulated: for $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$\pi_{i,U}(\bar{a}) \equiv P \left\{ \eta_i \in H_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | X_i, Y_{-i} \right\} \text{ and } \pi_{i,L}(\bar{a}) \equiv P \left\{ \eta_i \in H_{i,L}(\bar{a}) | X_i, Y_{-i} \right\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{i,U}(\bar{a}) & \equiv \left\{ \eta_i \in \mathbb{H} : \gamma_i(\bar{a}) = 1 \right\} \text{ and} \\ H_{i,L}(\bar{a}) & \equiv \left\{ \eta_i \in \mathbb{H} : \exists c \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}\} \text{ s.t. } \gamma_i(c) = 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$, we define

$$(8.4) \quad \begin{aligned} e_{i,L}(\bar{a}) &\equiv P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i\} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} \cdot \pi_{i,L}(\bar{a})\right) \text{ and} \\ e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) &\equiv P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i\} - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} \cdot \pi_{i,U}(\bar{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_i(\bar{a}) \equiv \rho 1\{\max_{t_i \in \mathbb{T}} \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i, \bar{a})\| > 0\}$.

As before, we choose a vector of nonnegative functions $\mathbf{g}_i = (g_{i1}, \dots, g_{iL})^\top : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)^L$. We introduce $\mathbf{w}_L, \mathbf{w}_U \in \mathbf{R}_+^{L(|\mathbb{A}|-1)}$, and define the event that the moment inequalities hold:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_U, \mathbf{w}_L) \equiv \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_{i,L} \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) + \mathbf{w}_L \geq 0 \\ &\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_{i,L} \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) - \mathbf{w}_U \leq 0 \end{aligned} \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{i,L}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{i,U}$ are $|\mathbb{A}| - 1$ dimensional vectors whose entries are $e_{i,L}(\bar{a})$ and $e_{i,U}(\bar{a})$ with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$, and $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product, and $\bar{a}_1$ is a fixed element of $\mathbb{A}$ used as a normalization. The following theorem is an extension of Theorem 2 to a multinomial action set.

THEOREM A2: *Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 hold. Then for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$,*

$$P[\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X))|X] \geq 1 - \frac{\tau}{2} (1\{\delta_U(X) > 0\} + 1\{\delta_L(X) > 0\}),$$

where the inequality holds almost everywhere, $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\delta_U(X)$ and $\delta_L(X)$ are as defined in and below (8.6).

To define $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$, $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$, $\delta_U(X)$ and $\delta_L(X)$, we first note that $\pi_{i,L}(\bar{a})$ and $\pi_{i,U}(\bar{a})$ are nonstochastic functions of (Y_{-i}, X_i) . We make explicit the dependence by writing $\pi_{i,L}(\bar{a})$ and $\pi_{i,U}(\bar{a})$ as $\pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a})$ and $\pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a})$. Define for $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(8.5) \quad \begin{aligned} d_{jL,L}(\bar{a}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a})) g_{iL}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} \text{ and} \\ d_{jL,U}(\bar{a}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a})) g_{iL}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}))$ and $V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}))$ are maximal variations of $\pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a})$ and $\pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a})$ in Y_j . We let $\mathbf{d}_{L,j}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{U,j}$ be $L(|\mathbb{A}| - 1)$ dimensional column vectors whose entries are given by $d_{jL,L}(\bar{a})$ and $d_{jL,U}(\bar{a})$, with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$ and then $l = 1, \dots, L$, keeping the same order as in the construction of $\mathbf{e}_{i,L} \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$. Then define $L(|\mathbb{A}| - 1) \times L(|\mathbb{A}| - 1)$ matrices:

$$(8.6) \quad \tilde{D}_L(X) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{d}_{L,j} \mathbf{d}_{L,j}^\top \text{ and } \tilde{D}_U(X) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{d}_{U,j} \mathbf{d}_{U,j}^\top.$$

Let $D_L(X)$ and $D_U(X)$ be the same matrices as $\tilde{D}_L(X)$ and $\tilde{D}_U(X)$ except that the zero entries are replaced by a small number $\eta > 0$.

Finally, let us define for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$,

$$(8.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X) &\equiv \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2\delta_L(X)} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right)} D_L(X) \mathbf{r}_L(X), \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) &\equiv \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2\delta_U(X)} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right)} D_U(X) \mathbf{r}_U(X), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_L(X)$ and $\delta_U(X)$ are Perron-Frobenius eigenvalues of $D_L(X)$ and $D_U(X)$ and $\mathbf{r}_L(X)$ and $\mathbf{r}_U(X)$ are associated positive eigenvectors.

8.3. Bootstrap Inference.

8.3.1. *Benchmark Bootstrap.* For each $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i,L}(\bar{a}; \theta) &\equiv 1\{Y_i = \bar{a}\} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} \cdot \pi_{i,L}(\bar{a})\right) \text{ and} \\ r_{i,U}(\bar{a}; \theta) &\equiv 1\{Y_i = \bar{a}\} - \frac{1}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} \cdot \pi_{i,U}(\bar{a}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{r}_{i,U}(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{r}_{i,L}(\theta)$ be column vectors whose entries are $r_{i,U}(\bar{a}; \theta)$ and $r_{i,L}(\bar{a}; \theta)$ with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$ just as $e_{i,L}(\bar{a})$'s and $e_{i,U}(\bar{a})$'s constitute $\mathbf{e}_{i,U}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{i,L}$. Then, we define

$$\mathbf{l}_U(\theta) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{r}_{i,U}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) \text{ and } \mathbf{l}_L(\theta) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{r}_{i,L}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i).$$

Using $\mathbf{l}_U(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{l}_L(\theta)$, we take the following as our test statistic:

$$T(\theta) = N \left\| [\mathbf{l}_U(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)]_+ + [\mathbf{l}_L(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)]_- \right\|^2,$$

where for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^\top \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $[\mathbf{x}]_+ = [\max\{x_j, 0\}]_{j=1}^d$ and $[\mathbf{x}]_- = [\max\{-x_j, 0\}]_{j=1}^d$.

We first draw $\varepsilon_{i,b}$'s with $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $b = 1, \dots, B$, from $N(0, 1)$ independently and identically distributed across i 's, and b 's. Consider the following bootstrap test statistic:

$$T_b^* \equiv \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Z}_i \varepsilon_{i,b} \right\|^2, \quad b = 1, \dots, B,$$

where $\hat{Z}_i$ is a column vector with entries

$$\hat{Z}_{il}(\bar{a}) \equiv 1\{Y_i = \bar{a}\} g_{il}(X_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N 1\{Y_k = \bar{a}\} g_{kl}(X_k),$$

with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$ and $l = 1, \dots, L$ in the same order as in $\mathbf{r}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$. Let $c_{1-\alpha, B}^*$ be the $(1 - \alpha + \tau(\theta))$ -th percentile of the bootstrap test statistics T_b^* , $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, where

$$\tau(\theta) = \frac{\tau}{2} (1 \{ \bar{\delta}_U(\theta) > 0 \} + 1 \{ \bar{\delta}_L(\theta) > 0 \}),$$

and $\bar{\delta}_U(\theta) = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}} \delta_U(x)$ and $\bar{\delta}_L(\theta) = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d_X}} \delta_L(x)$. The confidence set for $\theta \in \Theta$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{C}_B = \{ \theta \in \Theta : T(\theta) \leq \max\{c_{1-\alpha, B}^*, \varepsilon\} \},$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a fixed small number such as 0.001.

THEOREM A3: *Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 hold and that there exists a constant $C_g > 0$ such that*

$$(8.8) \quad P \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq l \leq L} |g_{il}(X_i)|^4 |C \right] < C_g \right\} = 1.$$

Then

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \{ \theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty \} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

8.3.2. Modified Bootstrap. When the hindsight regrets are negligible, we can obtain an improved inference method similarly as before. Let

$$T_b^{Mod*}(\theta) \equiv N \left\| [\mathbf{l}_{U,b}^*(\theta)]_+ + [\mathbf{l}_{L,b}^*(\theta)]_- \right\|^2, \quad b = 1, \dots, B,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{l}_{U,b}^*(\theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{r}_{i,U}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b} \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{l}_{L,b}^*(\theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{r}_{i,L}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b}. \end{aligned}$$

We take $c_{1-\alpha, B}^{Mod*}(\theta)$ to be the $(1 - \alpha + \tau(\theta))$ -th percentile of the bootstrap test statistics $T_b^{Mod*}(\theta)$, $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, and define the confidence set for $\theta \in \Theta$ to be

$$\mathcal{C}_B^{Mod} = \{ \theta \in \Theta : T(\theta) \leq \max\{c_{1-\alpha, B}^{Mod*}(\theta), \varepsilon\} \}.$$

The following theorem specifies the condition of asymptotically negligible hindsight regrets, and establishes the validity of the modified bootstrap confidence set $\mathcal{C}_B^{Mod}$. Define for $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

for $1 \leq l, k \leq L$ and for $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}(\bar{a}) &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X, \bar{a})) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{d}_{j,lk,L}(\bar{a}) &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X, \bar{a})) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i).\end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain the following result.

THEOREM A4: *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 3 hold and as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(8.9) \quad \max_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}} \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq L} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \left(\tilde{d}_{j,lk,L}^2(\bar{a}) + \tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}^2(\bar{a}) \right) | C \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Then,

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \{ \theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{\infty}^{Mod} \} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

When $g_{il}(\cdot)$'s are uniformly bounded by a constant, then the condition (8.9) can be replaced by the following

$$(8.10) \quad \max_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}} \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq L} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \left(d_{jl,L}^2(\bar{a}) + d_{jl,U}^2(\bar{a}) \right) | C \right] \rightarrow 0,$$

where $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a})$'s and $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a})$'s are as defined in (8.5). In many examples of asymptotically negligible hindsight regrets, both the conditions (8.9) and (8.10) are satisfied as we saw in Section 5.2.

The intuition behind the workings of the modified bootstrap for games with general acquaintance groups is similar to that we saw for binary actions in Section 5.2.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrews, D. W. K. (2005): "Cross-section Regression with Common Shocks," *Econometrica* 73, 1551-1585.
- [2] Andrews, D. W. K. and X. Shi (2013): "Inference Based on Conditional Moment Inequalities," *Econometrica* 81, 609-666.
- [3] Andrews, D. W. K., and G. Soares (2010): "Inference for Parameters Defined by Moment Inequalities Using Generalized Moment Selection," *Econometrica* 78, 119-157.
- [4] Aradillas-Lopez, A. (2010): "Semiparametric estimation of a simultaneous game with incomplete information," *Journal of Econometrics* 157, 409-431.
- [5] Aradillas-Lopez, A. and E. Tamer (2008): "The Identification Power of Equilibrium in Simple Games," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 26, 261-283.

- [6] Athey, S. (2001): "Single Crossing Properties and the Existence of Pure Strategy Equilibria in Games of Incomplete Information," *Econometrica* 69, 861-889.
- [7] Aumann, R. J. (1976): "Agreeing to Disagree," *Annals of Statistics* 4, 1236-1239.
- [8] Bajari, P., H. Hong, J. Krainer, and D. Nekipelov (2010): "Estimating Static Models of Strategic Interactions," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 28, 469-482.
- [9] Beresteanu, A., I. Molchanov, and F. Molinari (2011): "Sharp Identification Regions in Models with Convex Moment Predictions," *Econometrica* 79, 1785-1821.
- [10] Bergemann, D. and S. Morris (2011): "Robust Mechanism Design," *Econometrica* 73 1771-1813.
- [11] Bisin, A., A. Moro, and G. Topa (2011): "The Empirical Content of Models with Multiple Equilibria in Economies with Social Interactions," NBER Working Paper 17196.
- [12] Blume, L. E., W. A. Brock, S. N. Durlauf and R. Jayaraman (2011): "Linear Social Network Models," Working Paper.
- [13] Bresnahan, T. F. and P. C. Reiss (1991): "Empirical Models of Discrete Games," *Journal of Econometrics* 48, 57-81.
- [14] Brock, W. A. and S. N. Durlauf (2001a): "Interaction-Based Models," *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 5. Edited by J.J. Heckman, and E. Leamer. Elsevier Science.
- [15] Brock, W. A. and S. N. Durlauf (2001b): "Discrete Choice with Social Interactions," *Review of Economic Studies* 68, 235-260.
- [16] Brock, W. A. and S. N. Durlauf (2007): "Identification of Binary Choice Models with Social Interactions," *Journal of Econometrics* 140, 52-75.
- [17] Bugni, F. (2010): "Bootstrap Inference in Partially Identified Models Defined by Moment Inequalities: Coverage of the Identified Set," *Econometrica* 78, 735-753.
- [18] Bugni, F., I. A. Canay, and X. Shi (2013): "Specification Tests for Partially Identified Models Defined by Moment Inequalities," Working Paper.
- [19] Cameron, A. C., J. B. Gelbach, D. L. Miller (2008): "Bootstrap-Based Improvements for Inference with Clustered Errors," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 90, 414-427.
- [20] Chernozhukov, V., H. Hong, and E. Tamer (2007): "Estimation and Confidence Regions for Parameter Sets in Econometric Models," *Econometrica* 75, 1243-1284.
- [21] Chernozhukov, V. S. Lee, and A. Rosen (2008): "Intersection Bounds: Estimation and Inference," *Econometrica* 81, 667-737.
- [22] Ciliberto, F. and E. Tamer (2009): "Market Structure and Multiple Equilibria in Airline Markets," *Econometrica*, 77, 1791-1828.
- [23] Dawid, A. P. (1979): "Conditional Independence in Statistical Theory," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B.* 41, 1-31.
- [24] Dominitz, J. and C. F. Manski (1997): "Using Expectations Data to Study Subjective Income Expectations," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92, 855-867.
- [25] de Paula, A. (2013): "Econometric Analysis of Games with Multiple Equilibria," *Annual Economic Review*, 5, 107-131.
- [26] de Paula, A. and X. Tang (2011): "Inference of Signs of Interaction Effects in Simultaneous Games with Incomplete Information," *Econometrica* 80, 143-172.
- [27] Deb, J. and E. Kalai (2010): "Stability in Large Bayesian Games with Heterogeneous Players," Working Paper.

- [28] Hansen, C. B. (2007): "Asymptotic Properties of a Robust Variance Matrix Estimator for Panel Data When T is Large," *Journal of Econometrics* 141, 597-620.
- [29] Harsanyi, J. C. (1967-1968): "Games With Incomplete Information Played by Bayesian Players. Parts I, II, III." *Management Science* 14, 159-182, 320-334, 486-502.
- [30] Ioannides, Y. M. (2013): *From Neighborhoods to Nations: The Economics of Social Interactions*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- [31] Ioannides, Y. M. and J. Zabel (2008): "Interactions, Neighborhood Selection and Housing Demand," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63, 229-252.
- [32] Kalai, E. (2004): "Large Robust Games," *Econometrica* 72, 1631-1665.
- [33] Kim, J. and Y.-K. Che (2004): "Asymmetric Information about Rivals' Types in Standard Auctions," *Games and Economic Behavior* 46, 383-397.
- [34] Krauth, B. (2006): "Simulation-Based Estimation of Peer Effects," *Journal of Econometrics*, 133, 243-271.
- [35] Kuersteiner, G. M. and I. R. Prucha (2012): "Limit Theory for Panel Data Models with Cross Sectional Dependence and Sequential Exogeneity," Forthcoming in *Journal of Econometrics*.
- [36] Li, J. and L.-F. Lee (2009): "Binary Choice under Social Interactions: an Empirical Study with and without Subjective Data," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 24, 257-281.
- [37] Manski, C. F. (2004): "Measuring Expectations," *Econometrica* 72, 1329-1376.
- [38] McAdams, D. (2003): "Isotone Equilibrium in Games of Incomplete Information," *Econometrica* 71, 1191-1214.
- [39] McDiarmid, C. (1989): "On the Method of Bounded Differences," In *Surveys in Combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [40] Menzel, K. (2012): "Inference for Large Games with Exchangeable Players," Working Paper.
- [41] Mertens J-F. and S. Zamir (1985): "Formulation of Bayesian Analysis for Games with Incomplete Information," *International Journal of Game Theory* 14, 1-29.
- [42] Milgrom, P. R. and R. J. Weber (1985): "Distributional Strategies for Games with Incomplete Information," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10, 619-632.
- [43] Reny, P. (2011): "On the Existence of Monotone Pure-Strategy Equilibria in Bayesian Games," *Econometrica* 79, 499-553.
- [44] Rosen, A. (2008): "Confidence Sets for Partially Identified Parameters That Satisfy a Finite Number of Moment Inequalities," *Journal of Econometrics* 146, 107-117.
- [45] Serre, D. (2010): *Matrices: Theory and Applications*, Springer.
- [46] Tamer, E. (2003): "Incomplete Simultaneous Discrete Response Model with Multiple Equilibria," *Review of Economic Studies* 70, 147-165.
- [47] Wilson, R. (1989): "Game-Theoretic Analyses of Trading Processes," in *Advances in Economic Theory: Fifth World Congress*, ed. by T. Bewley. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, Chap. 2, 33-70.
- [48] Xu, H. (2012): "Social Interactions: A Game-Theoretic Approach," Working Paper.

Supplemental Note to “Econometric Inference on Large Bayesian Games with Heterogeneous Beliefs”

Kyungchul Song

Vancouver School of Economics, UBC

The supplemental note comprises three sections. The first section goes through various examples of social interactions models. The examples also cover both the cases of ordered action spaces and unordered action spaces. Examples of ordered action spaces are students’ effort levels, discrete amounts of firms’ investments, attention paid to media with different intensity, etc. Examples of unordered action spaces are choice sets in multinomial decision problems, such as choice of a school, a product, a location, or a candidate in elections. In each example, we provide an explicit form of belief-free hindsight regret in Theorem A1 in the appendix of the paper, and also show how the bounds in Theorem A2 there can also be explicitly computed. One can get a concrete idea of how derivation works, so that one may derive the bounds similarly for other examples that are not shown in this note, depending on the particular applications.

The second section provides a formal statement of the multivariate version of McDiarmid’s inequality. The proof is provided there. The precise form of this statement and the proof have not appeared in the literature as far as the author is concerned, although the proof follows with only a minor modification of the original proof of McDiarmid (1989).

The third section presents the full mathematical proofs of the results in the paper. The results include the belief-free hindsight results in Theorem A1, the testable implications in Theorem A2, and the bootstrap validity results in Theorems A3 and A4.

9. ILLUSTRATION THROUGH EXAMPLES

9.1. Social Interactions: The Case of Binary Decisions. Consider a private information large game in Example 2.3.1, where each player chooses an action from $\mathbb{A} = \{0, 1\}$. There are S disjoint information groups. The set of the players in each information group s is denoted by $\mathbb{N}_s$. The payoff differential for player i is given by

$$(9.1) \quad u_i(1, a_{-i}; T_i) - u_i(0, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i) + \frac{v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i)}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} a_j - \eta_i,$$

where $N_s = |\mathbb{N}_s|$ for some parametric functions $v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i)$, and $v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i)$. In many applications, one specifies $v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i) = \theta_2$, and the parameter θ_2 represents the significance of strategic interdependence among the players. We assume that the unobserved heterogeneity η_i is

independent of the observed covariate X_i and has a known CDF, say, G . We assume that G has a symmetric (around zero) and quasiconcave density such as a centered normal or logistic distribution.

The payoff differential in (9.1) facilitates computation of the explicit bounds in Theorem 2 as we see below. However, the distributional assumptions on η_i do not play any role in determining the belief-free hindsight regrets in Theorem 1. This is simply because the measure of strategic relevance $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ (defined in (3.3)) does not involve η_i due to the additive structure.

9.1.1. *Belief Hindsight Regrets in Theorem 1.* As for the hindsight regrets in Theorem 1, as we saw in Section 3.3.1, we have:

$$(9.2) \quad \lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i) = \frac{|v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i)|}{\sqrt{N_s - 1}} \sqrt{-\frac{1}{2} \log \rho}.$$

For notational brevity, we put $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho} = \lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i)$ from here on.

9.1.2. *Bounds in Theorem 2.* Now let us find $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\delta_U(X)$ and $\delta_L(X)$ in Theorem 2. By the additive structure in (9.1), we have

$$\pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i) = G(v_{1,i}^+ + v_{2,i}\bar{Y}_{-i,s}) \text{ and } \pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i) = 1 - G(v_{1,i}^- + v_{2,i}\bar{Y}_{-i,s}),$$

where we recall that G is the CDF of η_i , $\bar{Y}_{-i,s} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{1,i}^+ &\equiv v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i) + \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}, \\ v_{1,i}^- &\equiv v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i) - \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}, \text{ and} \\ v_{2,i} &\equiv v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

We need to find maximal variations of $\pi_{i,U}$ and $\pi_{i,L}$ as we perturb Y_j in $\bar{Y}_{-i,s}$, for each $j \neq i$.

Consider $\pi_{i,U}$ first. Choose player $j \neq i$ and define $\bar{Y}_{-ij,s} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s - 2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i,j\}} Y_k$. Then the maximal variation of $\pi_{i,U}$ solely due to the j -th player's perturbation of his own action becomes

$$\left| G\left(v_{1,i}^+ + \frac{v_{2,i}(N_s - 2)\bar{Y}_{-ij,s}}{N_s - 1} + \frac{v_{2,i}}{N_s - 1}\right) - G\left(v_{1,i}^+ + \frac{v_{2,i}(N_s - 2)\bar{Y}_{-i,s}}{N_s - 1}\right) \right|,$$

because the player can choose either 0 or 1. In order to obtain the maximal variation of $\pi_{i,U}$, we need to maximize the above difference over all the possible values that $\bar{Y}_{-ij,s}$. Note that the sample mean $\bar{Y}_{-ij,s}$ takes values from $[0, 1]$. Then we have

$$(9.3) \quad V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i)) \leq \sup_{y \in [0,1]} \left| G\left(v_{1,i}^+ + y h_i + \frac{v_{2,i}}{N_s - 1}\right) - G(v_{1,i}^+ + y h_i) \right|,$$

where

$$h_i \equiv \frac{v_{2,i}(N_s - 2)}{N_s - 1}.$$

Similarly for $\pi_{i,L}$, we find that

$$(9.4) \quad V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i)) \leq \sup_{y \in [0,1]} \left| G\left(v_{1,i}^- + yh_i + \frac{v_{2,i}}{N_s - 1}\right) - G(v_{1,i}^- + yh_i) \right|.$$

The inequalities (9.3) and (9.4) are due to the fact that we replace the supremum over the grid points $\{0, 1/(N_s - 2), 2/(N_s - 2), \dots, 1\}$ by the supremum over $[0, 1]$. As we shall see shortly, this replacement makes it possible to compute the explicit solution to the supremums, as we assume that G has a symmetric (around zero) and quasiconcave density. Hence we do not need to do the maximization over the set of grid points.

To obtain explicit solutions to the supremums in (9.3) and (9.4), we define for each $a < b$ and $\Delta \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$(9.5) \quad \varphi_s(\Delta; a, b) \equiv \operatorname{argmax}_{z \in [a,b]} \left| G\left(z + \frac{\Delta}{N_s - 1}\right) - G(z) \right|.$$

It is not hard to check that we have an explicit solution as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_s(\Delta; a, b) &= 1 \left\{ -\frac{\Delta}{2(N_s - 1)} < a \right\} a \\ &\quad + 1 \left\{ a \leq -\frac{\Delta}{2(N_s - 1)} \leq b \right\} \left(-\frac{\Delta}{2(N_s - 1)} \right) \\ &\quad + 1 \left\{ b \leq -\frac{\Delta}{2(N_s - 1)} \right\} b, \end{aligned}$$

due to the symmetry and quasiconcavity of the density of G . Then let

$$z_i^+ \equiv \begin{cases} \varphi_s(v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^+, v_{1,i}^+ + h_i), & \text{if } h_i \geq 0 \\ \varphi_s(v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^+ + h_i, v_{1,i}^+), & \text{if } h_i < 0 \end{cases}$$

and similarly,

$$z_i^- \equiv \begin{cases} \varphi_s(v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^-, v_{1,i}^- + h_i), & \text{if } h_i \geq 0 \\ \varphi_s(v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^- + h_i, v_{1,i}^-), & \text{if } h_i < 0 \end{cases}.$$

The quantities z_i^+ 's are solutions to the maximization problem in (9.5) depending on whether $(a, b) = (v_{1,i}^+, v_{1,i}^+ + h_i)$ or $(a, b) = (v_{1,i}^+ + h_i, v_{1,i}^+)$ which depends on whether $h_i \geq 0$ or not. Similarly the quantities z_i^- 's are solutions to the maximization problem in (9.5) depending on whether $(a, b) = (v_{1,i}^-, v_{1,i}^- + h_i)$ or $(a, b) = (v_{1,i}^- + h_i, v_{1,i}^-)$. Therefore, we conclude that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$,

$$(9.6) \quad \begin{aligned} V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i)) &\leq |G(z_i^+ + v_{2,i}/(N_s - 1)) - G(z_i^+)| \text{ and} \\ V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i)) &\leq |G(z_i^- + v_{2,i}/(N_s - 1)) - G(z_i^-)|, \end{aligned}$$

and for each $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}_s$,

$$V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i)) = 0 \text{ and } V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i)) = 0,$$

because player j outside the information group s of player i cannot have an impact on player i 's payoff differential. Note that the right hand side of (9.6) does not depend on j . Substituting the right hand sides of (9.6) for $V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i))$ and $V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i))$ in (4.12) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{jl,U} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\} |G(z_i^+ + v_{2,i}/(N_s - 1)) - G(z_i^+)| g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i}, \text{ and} \\ d_{jl,L} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\} |G(z_i^- + v_{2,i}/(N_s - 1)) - G(z_i^-)| g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\rho_i \equiv \rho 1\{|v_{2,i}| > 0\}$. (Replacing $V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}))$ and $V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}))$ by the right hand sides of (9.6) makes the bounds in Theorem 2 slightly larger. We suggest this replacement mainly due to its computational merit. The replacement does not affect the asymptotic validity of the procedure regardless of whether N_s is large or small.)

Let $\mathbf{d}_{L,j}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{U,j}$ be L dimensional vector whose entries are given by $d_{jl,L}$ and $d_{jl,U}$ with $l = 1, \dots, L$. Using these vectors, define $L \times L$ matrices:

$$\tilde{D}_L(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{d}_{L,j} \mathbf{d}_{L,j}^\top \text{ and } \tilde{D}_U(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{d}_{U,j} \mathbf{d}_{U,j}^\top.$$

Finally, we construct for a given small number $\tau \in (0, 1)$ $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ as in (4.14).

Note that when G has a bounded density, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\{d_{jl,U}^2 + d_{jl,L}^2\} g_{jk}^2(X_j) | C] \leq \frac{C_1}{N(1 - \rho)^2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E} [g_{jl}^2(X_j) g_{jk}^2(X_j) | C],$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. Therefore, under (8.8), the condition of Theorem 4 holds, so that we can use the modified bootstrap procedure.

When $|\mathbb{N}_s| \geq n$ for all $s = 1, \dots, S$ (so that all the information groups are of same size n) and $v_{2,\theta_2}(\cdot)$ is bounded, we can check that $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho} = O(n^{-1/2})$ (uniformly over $1 \leq i \leq N$) everywhere and both $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ are of order $O_P((nS)^{-1/2}) = O(N^{-1/2})$ everywhere. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X) = \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ become asymptotically negligible. But when $S \rightarrow \infty$ with n fixed, only $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ becomes asymptotically negligible.

9.2. Social Interactions: The Case of an Ordered Action Space. Consider a situation where individual players choose from an ordered action space $\mathbb{A} = \{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_K\}$, $0 = \bar{a}_1 < \dots < \bar{a}_K$. As before, we assume that there are S disjoint information groups. The set of

the players in each information group s is denoted by $\mathbb{N}_s$. Suppose that for each $k = 1, \dots, K$ and for each player i , the payoff differential is given by

$$u_i(\bar{a}_k, a_{-i}; T_i) - u_i(\bar{a}_1, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i) + \frac{v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i) \bar{a}_k}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} a_j - \eta_i,$$

where η_i 's are i.i.d with CDF G and independent of X_i 's. When $v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i) > 0$, there is strategic complementarity between player i and the other players in his information group. Similarly as before, we assume that G has a symmetric (around zero) and quasiconcave density such as a centered normal or logistic distribution.

9.2.1. Belief-Free Hindsight Regrets in Theorem A1. To define belief-free hindsight regret in Theorem A1, first note that for each $k = 2, \dots, K$ and for each $j \neq i$, $\Delta_{ij,\rho}(T_i; y_i(T_i))$ is a $K - 1$ vector of zeros if $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}_s$, and

$$\Delta_{ij}(T_i; y_i(T_i)) = \frac{v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i) \bar{a}_K}{N_s - 1} [\|\bar{a}_k - y_i(T_i)\|]_{k=1, \bar{a}_k \neq y_i(T_i)}^K,$$

if $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$. The difference between $y_i(T_i)$ and $\bar{a}_k$ represents the difference between player i 's action in equilibrium (observed the econometrician) and her alternative action $\bar{a}_k$. The $\bar{a}_K$ is the maximum perturbation of actions possible by player j . Then, we define $\tilde{\Lambda}_i(T_i)$ as

$$(9.7) \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_i(T_i) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} \Delta_{ij,\rho}(T_i; y_i(T_i)) \Delta_{ij,\rho}(T_i; y_i(T_i))^\top.$$

Using $\tilde{\Lambda}_i(t_i)$, we define $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (8.2). For $k = 2, \dots, K$, let the $(k - 1)$ -th entry of $\lambda_{i,\rho}(T_i)$ be denoted by $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k)$.

9.2.2. Bounds in Theorem A2. Let us turn to the bounds in Theorem A2. We proceed similarly as before, with some modifications. We define for $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= G(v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k) + v_{2,i} \bar{a}_k \bar{Y}_{-i,s}) \text{ and} \\ \pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= 1 - G(v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) + v_{2,i} \bar{a}_k \bar{Y}_{-i,s}), \end{aligned}$$

where we set $\bar{Y}_{-i,s} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i) + \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k), \\ v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{1,\theta_1}(X_i) - \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k), \text{ and} \\ v_{2,i} &\equiv v_{2,\theta_2}(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

For the computation of the maximal variations of $\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$ and $\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$, we first define

$$h_i(\bar{a}_k) = \frac{v_{2,i} \bar{a}_K (N_s - 2) \bar{a}_k}{N_s - 1}.$$

Note that the factor $\bar{a}_K$ is the maximum variation caused to $\bar{Y}_{-ij,s} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s-2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i,j\}} Y_k$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$ by an arbitrary perturbation of actions by the players in $\mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i,j\}$. The smallest value of zero for the sample mean $\bar{Y}_{-ij,s}$ arises when all the players in $\mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i,j\}$ takes 0 and the largest value of $\bar{a}_K$ arises when all the players take $\bar{a}_K$. Recall the definition of φ_s in (9.5). Let

$$z_i^+(\bar{a}_k) \equiv \begin{cases} \varphi_s(\bar{a}_K v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k), v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) \geq 0 \\ \varphi_s(\bar{a}_K v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k), v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) < 0 \end{cases}$$

and similarly,

$$z_i^-(\bar{a}_k) \equiv \begin{cases} \varphi_s(\bar{a}_K v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k), v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) \geq 0 \\ \varphi_s(\bar{a}_K v_{2,i}; v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k), v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) < 0 \end{cases}.$$

The premultiplication by $\bar{a}_K$ in $\bar{a}_K v_{2,i}$ above is due to the fact that the maximum impact any individual player $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$ can cause to player i 's payoff is $\bar{a}_K v_{2,i}/(N_s - 1)$. For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 2, \dots, K$, the maximal variations $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k)$ and $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k)$ are then taken as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{1 - \rho_i} \left| G \left(z_i^+(\bar{a}_k) + \frac{v_{2,i} \bar{a}_k}{N_s - 1} \right) - G(z_i^+(\bar{a}_k)) \right| g_{il}(X_i), \text{ and} \\ d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{1 - \rho_i} \left| G \left(z_i^-(\bar{a}_k) + \frac{v_{2,i} \bar{a}_k}{N_s - 1} \right) - G(z_i^-(\bar{a}_k)) \right| g_{il}(X_i), \end{aligned}$$

with $\rho_i \equiv \rho 1\{|v_{2,i}| > 0\}$. Let $\mathbf{d}_{L,j}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{U,j}$ be $L(K-1)$ dimensional vectors obtained by vertically stacking up $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k)$'s and $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k)$'s with $k = 2, \dots, K$ first and then $l = 1, \dots, L$. Using these vectors, define $L(K-1) \times L(K-1)$ matrices:

$$(9.8) \quad \tilde{D}_L(X) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{d}_{L,j} \mathbf{d}_{L,j}^\top \text{ and } \tilde{D}_U(X) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{d}_{U,j} \mathbf{d}_{U,j}^\top.$$

Finally, we construct for a given small number $\tau \in (0, 1)$ $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ as in (8.7).

9.3. Social Interactions: The Case of an Unordered Action Space. Let us consider a situation where the action space is $\mathbb{A} = \{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_K\}$, and the action space does not have any meaningful ordering, as in the case of a choice set in a multinomial choice model. As before, we assume that there are S disjoint information groups. The set of the players in each information group s is denoted by $\mathbb{N}_s$. Suppose that for each $k = 2, \dots, K$ and for each player i , the payoff differential is given by

$$u_i(\bar{a}_k, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_{1,\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i) + \frac{v_{2,\theta_2}^{(k)}(X_i)}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} 1\{a_j = \bar{a}_k\} - \eta_{ik},$$

where $v_{1,\theta_1}^{(k)}$'s and $v_{2,\theta_2}^{(k)}$'s are parametric functions, and the unobserved heterogeneity vector $\eta_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iK})$ follows the Type 1 extreme value distribution. The payoff of player i choosing action $\bar{a}_k$ as opposed to $\bar{a}_1$ depends on the proportion of the other people in her information group s who also choose the same action $\bar{a}_k$:

$$\frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} 1 \{a_j = \bar{a}_k\}.$$

When one specifies $v_{2,\theta_2}^{(k)}(X_i) = \theta_2$, the parameter θ_2 measures the significance of such proportions on player i 's decision on choosing $\bar{a}_k$.

9.3.1. *Hindsight Regrets in Theorem A1.* As for the hindsight regrets in Theorem A1, for each $j \neq i$, $\Delta_{ij}(T_i; y_i(T_i))$ is a $K - 1$ vector defined as

$$\Delta_{ij}(T_i; y_i(T_i)) = \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1} \left[|v_{2,\theta_2}^{(k)}(X_i)| \right]_{k=1, \bar{a}_k \neq y_i(T_i)}^K.$$

Then, we define $\tilde{\Lambda}_i(T_i)$ as in (9.7), and define $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (8.2). For each $k = 2, \dots, K$, we let the $(k - 1)$ -th entry of $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ be denoted by $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k)$ as before.

9.3.2. *Bounds in Theorem A2.* As for the bounds in Theorem A2, we define for $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{1,\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i) + \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k), \\ v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{1,\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i) - \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k), \text{ and} \\ v_{2,i}^{(k)} &\equiv v_{2,\theta_2}^{(k)}(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

Then, let $\bar{Y}_{-i,s} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_j$ as before. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= P_{i,k}^+(\bar{Y}_{-i,s}, 0) \text{ and} \\ \pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= P_{i,k}^-(\bar{Y}_{-i,s}, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,k}^+(y, x) &= \frac{\exp \left(v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_k) + v_{2,i}^{(k)} y + x \right)}{1 + \sum_{r=2}^K \exp \left(v_{1,i}^+(\bar{a}_r) + v_{2,i}^{(r)} y + x \right)} \text{ and} \\ P_{i,k}^-(y, x) &= \frac{\exp \left(v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) + v_{2,i}^{(k)} y + x \right)}{1 + \sum_{r=2}^K \exp \left(v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_r) + v_{2,i}^{(r)} y + x \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the maximal variation of $\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$ and $\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$ along the j -th coordinate for $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)) &= \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_s} \left| P_{i,k}^+ \left(y, \frac{v_{2,i}^{(k)}}{N_s - 1} \right) - P_{i,k}^+(y, 0) \right|, \text{ and} \\ V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)) &= \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_s} \left| P_{i,k}^- \left(y, \frac{v_{2,i}^{(k)}}{N_s - 1} \right) - P_{i,k}^-(y, 0) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_s = \{0, 1/(N_s - 2), 2/(N_s - 2), \dots, 1\}$. Note that the maximal variations above do not depend on $j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}$. Using this, we find that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 2, \dots, K$, the maximal variations $d_{jL,U}(\bar{a}_k)$ and $d_{jL,L}(\bar{a}_k)$ are then defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{jL,U}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{1 - \rho_i^{(k)}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_s} \left| P_{i,k}^+ \left(y, \frac{v_{2,i}^{(k)}}{N_s - 1} \right) - P_{i,k}^+(y, 0) \right| g_{il}(X_i), \text{ and} \\ d_{jL,L}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_s} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{1 - \rho_i^{(k)}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_s} \left| P_{i,k}^- \left(y, \frac{v_{2,i}^{(k)}}{N_s - 1} \right) - P_{i,k}^-(y, 0) \right| g_{il}(X_i), \end{aligned}$$

with $\rho_i^{(k)} \equiv \rho 1\{|v_{2,i}^{(k)}| > 0\}$. Using $d_{jL,U}(\bar{a}_k)$ and $d_{jL,L}(\bar{a}_k)$ with $k = 2, \dots, K$, we define $L(K-1) \times L(K-1)$ matrices $\tilde{D}_L(X)$ and $\tilde{D}_U(X)$ as in (9.8). Finally, we construct for a given small number $\tau \in (0, 1)$ $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ as in (8.7).

9.4. A Large Game with Multiple Overlapping Reference Groups: The Case of Ordered Action Space. Suppose that the large game is a private information game with multiple overlapping information groups $\mathbb{N}_s$ with $s = 1, \dots, S$. The action space is ordered as $0 = \bar{a}_1 < \dots < \bar{a}_K$. The payoff function for player i takes the following form: for each $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$u_i(\bar{a}_k, a_{-i}; T_i) - u_i(\bar{a}_1, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_{\theta_1}(\bar{a}_k; X_i) + \frac{\bar{a}_k \theta_2}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \left(\frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} a_j \right) + \eta_i,$$

where $\mathbb{S}_i \subset \mathbb{S}$ denotes the set of the indices of the reference groups that player i belongs to, and η_i 's are i.i.d. random variables independent of X_i , and have a marginal CDF G whose density is symmetric around zero and quasiconcave.

Each group s may represent social groups. The within-group correlation is permitted through the public signal C_s . More importantly the reference groups are allowed to be overlapping, so that each player i may belong to multiple reference groups simultaneously and yet differently from many other players.

9.4.1. *Belief-Free Hindsight Regret in Theorem A1.* Let player i belong to information group s . Then for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i)) = \frac{\bar{a}_K \theta_2}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \left(\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1\{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1} \right) \left[\|\bar{a}_k - y_i(t_i)\|_{k=1:\bar{a}_k \neq y_i(t_i)}^K \right],$$

so that $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ is a $K - 1$ dimensional column vector. Then, we define $\tilde{\Lambda}_i(T_i)$ as in (9.7), and define $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (8.2). For each $k = 2, \dots, K$, we let the $(k - 1)$ -th entry of $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ be denoted by $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k)$.

In particular, when $\mathbb{A} = \{0, 1\}$, the term $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ becomes a scalar so that $\lambda_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ is also a scalar map in the following form:

$$|\theta| \sqrt{-\frac{\log \rho}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i\}} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1\{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1} \right)^2},$$

as we saw in Section 3.3.2.

9.4.2. *Bounds in Theorem A2.* We consider the bounds in Theorem A2. Similarly as before, we define for $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= G(v_i^+(\bar{a}_k) + \theta_2 \bar{a}_k \bar{Y}_{-i}) \text{ and} \\ \pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= 1 - G(v_i^-(\bar{a}_k) + \theta_2 \bar{a}_k \bar{Y}_{-i}), \end{aligned}$$

where we set $\bar{Y}_{-i,s} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} Y_j$ and

$$\bar{Y}_{-i} \equiv \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \bar{Y}_{-i,s},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_i^+(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{\theta_1}(\bar{a}_k; X_i) + \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k), \text{ and} \\ v_i^-(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{\theta_1}(\bar{a}_k; X_i) - \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k). \end{aligned}$$

For the computation of the maximal variations of $\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$ and $\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$, we define

$$h_i(\bar{a}_k) = \frac{\theta_2 \bar{a}_K \bar{a}_k}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{N_s - 2}{N_s - 1}.$$

To obtain explicit solutions to the supremums in (9.3) and (9.4), we define for each $a < b$ and $\Delta \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$\varphi_i(\Delta; a, b) \equiv \operatorname{argmax}_{z \in [a, b]} \left| G \left(z + \frac{\Delta}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \right) - G(z) \right|.$$

It is not hard to check that we have an explicit solution as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(\Delta; a, b) &= 1 \left\{ -\frac{\Delta}{2|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} < a \right\} a \\ &\quad + 1 \left\{ a \leq -\frac{\Delta}{2|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \leq b \right\} \left(-\frac{\Delta}{2|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \right) \\ &\quad + 1 \left\{ b \leq -\frac{\Delta}{2|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \right\} b,\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$z_i^+(\bar{a}_k) \equiv \begin{cases} \varphi_i(\theta_2 \bar{a}_K; v_i^+(\bar{a}_k), v_i^+(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) \geq 0 \\ \varphi_i(\theta_2 \bar{a}_K; v_i^+(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k), v_i^+(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) < 0 \end{cases}$$

and similarly,

$$z_i^-(\bar{a}_k) \equiv \begin{cases} \varphi_i(\theta_2 \bar{a}_K; v_i^-(\bar{a}_k), v_i^-(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) \geq 0 \\ \varphi_i(\theta_2 \bar{a}_K; v_i^-(\bar{a}_k) + h_i(\bar{a}_k), v_i^-(\bar{a}_k)), & \text{if } h_i(\bar{a}_k) < 0 \end{cases}.$$

For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 2, \dots, K$, the maximal variations $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k)$ and $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k)$ are then taken as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|G(z_i^+(\bar{a}_k) + \theta_2 \bar{a}_K p_{ij}) - G(z_i^+(\bar{a}_k))| g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_1}, \text{ and} \\ d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|G(z_i^-(\bar{a}_k) + \theta_2 \bar{a}_K p_{ij}) - G(z_i^-(\bar{a}_k))| g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_1},\end{aligned}$$

with $\rho_1 \equiv \rho 1\{|\theta_2| > 0\}$, and

$$p_{ij} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1\{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1}.$$

Using $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k)$'s and $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k)$'s, define $L(K-1) \times L(K-1)$ matrices $\tilde{D}_L(X)$ and $\tilde{D}_U(X)$ as in (9.8), and construct for a given small number $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ as in (8.7).

9.5. A Large Game with Multiple Overlapping Reference Groups: The Case of Unordered Action Space. Similarly as before, let us consider the case that the large game is a private information game with multiple overlapping information groups $\mathbb{N}_s$ with $s = 1, \dots, S$. The action space is an unordered set $\{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_K\}$. Suppose that the payoff for

player i is specified as follows: for $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$u_i(\bar{a}_k, a_{-i}; T_i) = v_{\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i) + \frac{\theta_{2,k}}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \left(\frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} 1\{a_j = \bar{a}_k\} \right) - \eta_{ik},$$

where $\mathbb{S}_i \subset \mathbb{S}$ denotes the set of the indices of the reference groups that player i belongs to, and, $v_{\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i)$ is a parametric function, and the unobserved heterogeneity vector $\eta_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iK})$ follows the Type 1 extreme value distribution. The payoff of player i choosing action $\bar{a}_k$ depends on the average of the proportions of players choosing $\bar{a}_k$ among the social group s 's that player i belongs to.

9.5.1. *Belief-Free Hindsight Regret in Theorem A1.* Let player i belong to information group s . Then for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i)) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \left(\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1\{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1} \right) [\theta_{2,k}]_{k=1, k \neq y_i(t_i)}^K,$$

so that $\Delta_{ij}(t_i; y_i(t_i))$ is a $K - 1$ dimensional column vector. Then, we define $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_i(T_i)$ as in (9.7), and define $\mathbf{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ as in (8.2). As before, for each $k = 2, \dots, K$, we let the $(k - 1)$ -th entry of $\mathbf{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(t_i)$ be denoted by $\bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k)$.

9.5.2. *Bounds in Theorem A2.* As for the bounds in Theorem A2, we define for $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_i^+(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i) + \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k), \text{ and} \\ v_i^-(\bar{a}_k) &\equiv v_{\theta_1}^{(k)}(X_i) - \bar{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(\bar{a}_k). \end{aligned}$$

Then, let

$$B_{-i}^{(k)} \equiv \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \left(\frac{1}{N_s - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}} 1\{Y_j = \bar{a}_k\} \right),$$

and

$$\mathbf{B}_{-i} = \begin{bmatrix} B_{-i}^{(2)} \\ B_{-i}^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ B_{-i}^{(K)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now we write

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{i,U}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= \bar{\pi}_{i,U}(\mathbf{B}_{-i}, 0; \bar{a}_k) \text{ and} \\ \pi_{i,L}(Y_{-i}, X_i; \bar{a}_k) &= \bar{\pi}_{i,L}(\mathbf{B}_{-i}, 0; \bar{a}_k), \end{aligned}$$

where, for $\theta_2 = (\theta_{2,2}, \dots, \theta_{2,K})$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_2, \dots, y_K) \in [0, 1]^{K-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\pi}_{i,U}(\mathbf{y}, \theta_2; \bar{a}_k) &= P_{i,k}^+ \left(\mathbf{y}, \frac{\theta_{2,k}}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \right) \text{ and} \\ \bar{\pi}_{i,L}(\mathbf{y}, \theta_2; \bar{a}_k) &= P_{i,k}^- \left(\mathbf{y}, \frac{\theta_{2,k}}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1}{N_s - 1} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}P_{i,k}^+(\mathbf{y}, x) &= \frac{\exp(v_i^+(\bar{a}_k) + \theta_{2,k}y_k + x)}{1 + \sum_{r=2}^K \exp(v_i^+(\bar{a}_r) + \theta_{2,r}y_r + x)} \text{ and} \\ P_{i,k}^-(\mathbf{y}, x) &= \frac{\exp(v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_k) + \theta_{2,k}y_k + x)}{1 + \sum_{r=2}^K \exp(v_{1,i}^-(\bar{a}_r) + \theta_{2,r}y_r + x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the maximal variation of $\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$ and $\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)$ along the j -th coordinate for $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)) &= \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_s} |\bar{\pi}_{i,U}(\mathbf{y}, p_{ijk}; \bar{a}_k) - \bar{\pi}_{i,U}(\mathbf{y}, 0; \bar{a}_k)|, \text{ and} \\ V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a}_k)) &= \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_s} |\bar{\pi}_{i,L}(\mathbf{y}, p_{ijk}; \bar{a}_k) - \bar{\pi}_{i,L}(\mathbf{y}, 0; \bar{a}_k)|,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_s = \{0, 1/(N_s - 2), 2/(N_s - 2), \dots, 1\}^{K-1}$ and

$$p_{ijk} = \frac{\theta_{2,k}}{|\mathbb{S}_i|} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_i} \frac{1 \{j \in \mathbb{N}_s \setminus \{i\}\}}{N_s - 1}.$$

Using this, we find that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 2, \dots, K$, the maximal variations $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k)$ and $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k)$ are then defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_s} |\bar{\pi}_{i,U}(\mathbf{y}, p_{ijk}; \bar{a}_k) - \bar{\pi}_{i,U}(\mathbf{y}, 0; \bar{a}_k)| g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho}, \text{ and} \\ d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_s} |\bar{\pi}_{i,L}(\mathbf{y}, p_{ijk}; \bar{a}_k) - \bar{\pi}_{i,L}(\mathbf{y}, 0; \bar{a}_k)| g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho}.\end{aligned}$$

By stacking up $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}_k)$ and $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}_k)$, $k = 2, \dots, K$, and $l = 1, \dots, L$, we construct $L(K - 1) \times L(K - 1)$ matrices $\tilde{D}_L(X)$ and $\tilde{D}_U(X)$ as in (9.8). Finally, we construct for a given small number $\tau \in (0, 1)$ $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ as in (8.7).

10. MULTIVARIATE EXTENSION OF McDIARMID'S INEQUALITY

We extend McDiarmid's inequality (McDiarmid (1989)) to a multivariate situation. Here is the result.

LEMMA A1 (MULTIVARIATE McDIARMID'S INEQUALITY): *Let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N) \in \mathbf{R}^N$ be a random vector such that the entries are conditionally independent given a random vector Z . Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_L) : \mathbf{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^L$ be a given map. Then the following holds.*

(i) *For all $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in (0, \infty)^L$,*

$$P\{\mathbf{f}(X) - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{f}(X)|Z] \geq \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | Z\} \leq \exp(-2\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}),$$

where Λ is an $L \times L$ matrix whose (l, k) -th entry is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^N V_i(f_l) V_i(f_k),$$

and $V_i(f_l)$ and $V_i(f_k)$ are the maximal variations of f_l and f_k along the i -th coordinate.

(ii) *For all $\rho > 0$, we have*

$$P\left\{\mathbf{f}(X) - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{f}(X)|Z] \geq -\sqrt{-\frac{\log \rho}{2\pi_\Lambda}} \Lambda \mathbf{e}_\Lambda | Z\right\} \leq \rho,$$

where $\pi_\Lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{e}_\Lambda$ are the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and eigenvector of matrix Λ defined in (i).

Note that the matrix Λ is positive semidefinite but not necessarily nonsingular. This multivariate bound is crucial for obtaining a form of belief-free hindsight regret that is tight enough for the econometrician's use.

PROOF: (i) The proof here is obtained by slightly modifying the proof of Theorem 6.7 of McDiarmid (1989). For transparency, a full proof is provided. Suppose that $g(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is a real-valued function on a set $\mathcal{X}^N \subset \mathbf{R}^N$. We recall here the definition of maximal variation of a function at a coordinate j :

$$V_j(g) = \sup |g(x) - g(x_j(x))|,$$

where the supremum is over all x 's in $\mathcal{X}^N$ and over all $x_j(x)$'s in $\mathcal{X}^N$ such that $x_j(x)$ is x except for its j -th entry. We also define

$$\begin{aligned} V_j^+(g) &= \sup\{g(x) - g(x_j(x))\} \text{ and} \\ V_j^-(g) &= \inf\{g(x) - g(x_j(x))\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum and the infimum are over all x 's in $\mathcal{X}^N$ and over all $x_j(x)$'s in $\mathcal{X}^N$ such that $x_j(x)$ is x except for its j -th entry. For each $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $l = 1, \dots, L$, let

$g_{i,l}(X) \equiv \mathbf{E}[f_l(X)|\mathcal{G}_i]$, $\mathcal{G}_i \equiv (X_1, \dots, X_i)$, and $g_{0,l}(X) \equiv \mathbf{E}[f_l(X)|Z]$. Then observe that for each $l = 1, \dots, L$,

$$D_{i,l}^- \leq g_{i,l}(X) - g_{i-1,l}(X) \leq D_{i,l}^+,$$

where $D_{i,l}^+ = V_i^+(g_{i,l} - g_{i-1,l})$ and $D_{i,l}^- = V_i^-(g_{i,l} - g_{i-1,l})$. Note that

$$D_{i,l}^+ - D_{i,l}^- \leq V_i(g_{i,l} - g_{i-1,l}) \leq V_i(f_l) \equiv c_{i,l}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that for any $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_L)^\top \in (0, \infty)^L$,

$$0 \leq \sum_{l=1}^L t_l (D_{i,l}^+ - D_{i,l}^-) \leq \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{c}_i,$$

where $\mathbf{c}_i = (c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,L})^\top$. By Hoeffding's Lemma (see Lemma 5.8 of McDiarmid (1989)), we find that for all $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_L)^\top \in (0, \infty)^L$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^L t_l (g_{i,l}(X) - g_{i-1,l}(X)) \right) | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}, Z \right] \leq \exp \left(\frac{(\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{c}_i)^2}{8} \right).$$

We let $\mathbf{g}_i = (g_{i,1}, \dots, g_{i,L})^\top$ and bound $P\{\mathbf{f}(X) - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{f}(X)|Z] \geq \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | Z\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{g}_i(X) - \mathbf{g}_{i-1}(X))} | Z \right] \\ &= e^{-\mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{g}_i(X) - \mathbf{g}_{i-1}(X))} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{\mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{g}_N(X) - \mathbf{g}_{N-1}(X))} | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}, Z \right] | Z \right] \\ &\leq e^{-\mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{g}_i(X) - \mathbf{g}_{i-1}(X))} e^{(\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{c}_i)^2/8} | Z \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By repeating the steps in the equality above, we bound the last term by

$$e^{-\mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{c}_i)^2/8} = e^{-\mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \mathbf{t}/8},$$

where we note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{c}_i)^2 = \mathbf{t}^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{c}_i^\top \right) \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^\top \Lambda \mathbf{t}.$$

A minimizer $\mathbf{t}$ of the last exponential function is given by $\mathbf{t} = 4\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, giving the bound as $e^{-2\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \Lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$.

(ii) By replacing $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = c\mathbf{s}$ in (i), for some $c > 0$, where $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S}_1 \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^L : \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1\}$, we obtain the following

$$P\{\mathbf{f}(X) - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{f}(X)|Z] \geq c\Lambda \mathbf{s} | Z\} \leq \exp(-2c^2 \mathbf{s}^\top \Lambda \mathbf{s}).$$

We minimize the exponential bound over $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ to find that $P\{\mathbf{f}(X) - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{f}(X)|Z] \geq \Lambda \mathbf{s}_\Lambda | Z\} \leq \exp(-2c^2 \pi_\Lambda)$, where π_Λ is a maximum eigenvalue of Λ , and $\mathbf{s}_\Lambda$ is an associated eigenvector.

Note that Λ is a positive semidefinite and nonnegative matrix. Hence π_Λ is a Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue, and we can take $\mathbf{s}_\Lambda$ to be the associated eigenvector $\mathbf{e}_\Lambda$ that has nonnegative entries. (See Theorem 8.1 of Serre (2010), p.150.) Finally, by replacing c by $\sqrt{-(\log \rho)/(2\pi_\Lambda)}$, we find the desired inequality. ■

11. MATHEMATICAL PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

We prove the results of Theorems A1-A4 in the appendix of the paper. Theorems 1-4 follow as corollaries for the special case of $\mathbb{A} = \{0, 1\}$.

PROOF OF THEOREM A1: Since T_i 's, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are conditionally independent given C by Assumption 1, $(T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i\}}$ is conditionally independent given (T_i, C) . (See Lemma 4.2(ii) of Dawid (1979).) Since T_i already contains C_s as its subvector, we deduce that $(T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i\}}$ is conditionally independent given T_i . Now we use this conditional independence to apply Lemma A1. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}_+ \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}_+^{|\mathbb{A}|-1} : \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1\}$, and any $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_i \{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(Y_{-i}; T_i, Y_i) > c \mathbf{\Lambda}_i(t_i) \mathbf{v} | T_i = t_i \} \\ & \geq 1 - \exp(-2c^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_i(t_i) \mathbf{v}), \end{aligned}$$

as in (3.6), by Lemma A1(i). By Lemma A1(ii), the last bound becomes $1 - \rho$, once we choose $c = \sqrt{-\log \rho / (2\psi_i(t_i))}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_i(t_i)$. The second statement follows from Assumption 2 and the first statement. ■

PROOF OF THEOREM A2: We focus on the case where $\delta_U(X) > 0$ and $\delta_L(X) > 0$. The cases where $\delta_U(X) = 0$ and $\delta_L(X) = 0$ are simpler to deal with. Define the event: for $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$S_{i,U}(\bar{a}) \equiv \{ \mathbf{u}_i^\Delta(T_i, \bar{a}) \geq -\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(T_i, \bar{a}) \}.$$

By the definition of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,\rho}(T_i, \bar{a})$, Assumption 1, and the second statement of Theorem 1, we have (everywhere)

$$(11.1) \quad P\{S_{i,U}(Y_i) | T_i\} \geq 1 - \rho.$$

Now, observe that

$$(11.2) \quad P\{S_{i,U}(Y_i) | T_i\} = \sum_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}} P\{S_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | T_i\} 1\{Y_i = \bar{a}\} \geq 1 - \rho.$$

The first equality uses the fact that $Y_i = y_i(T_i)$ is measurable with respect to the σ -field of T_i . From this and the fact that $Y_i = y_i(T_i)$, we deduce that

$$(11.3) \quad 1\{Y_i = \bar{a}\} \leq 1 \left\{ P\{\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | T_i\} \geq 1 - \rho \right\},$$

where $\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) \equiv S_{i,U}(\bar{a}) \cap \{Y_i = \bar{a}\}$. Similarly also from (11.2), we have

$$1\{Y_i \neq \bar{a}\} \leq 1 \left\{ \sum_{c \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}\}} P\{S_{i,U}(c) \cap \{Y_i = c\} | T_i\} \geq 1 - \rho \right\}.$$

Since $S_{i,U}(c) \cap \{Y_i = c\}$ is disjoint across c 's, we conclude that

$$1\{Y_i \neq \bar{a}\} \leq 1 \left\{ P\left\{ \tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) | T_i \right\} \geq 1 - \rho \right\},$$

where

$$\tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) \equiv \bigcup_{c \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}\}} S_{i,U}(c) \cap \{Y_i = c\}.$$

Taking conditional expectation given (Y_{-i}, X_i) on both sides of (11.3) and using Markov's inequality, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (11.4) \quad P\{Y_i = \bar{a} | X_i\} &\leq \frac{1}{1-\rho} \mathbf{E} \left[P(\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | T_i) | X_i \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\rho} P(\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | Y_{-i}, X_i) - \frac{1}{1-\rho} R_{i,U}(\bar{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{i,U}(\bar{a}) \equiv P(\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | Y_{-i}, X_i) - P(\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | X_i)$. Similarly,

$$(11.5) \quad P\{Y_i \neq \bar{a} | X_i\} \leq \frac{1}{1-\rho} P(\tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) | Y_{-i}, X_i) - \frac{1}{1-\rho} R_{i,L}(\bar{a}),$$

where $R_{i,L}(\bar{a}) \equiv P(\tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) | Y_{-i}, X_i) - P(\tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) | X_i)$.

Since $g_{il}(X_i) \geq 0$, we multiply both ends of (11.4) by $g_{il}(X_i)$, sum them up over $i = 1, \dots, N$, and divide them by N to find that for $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (11.6) \quad &\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N P\{Y_i = \bar{a} | X_i\} g_{il}(X_i) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{1-\rho} P(\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) | Y_{-i}, X_i) g_{il}(X_i) - v_{l,U}(\bar{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where $v_{l,U}(\bar{a}) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{1-\rho} R_{i,U}(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i)$. Similarly, from (11.5), we also find that

$$\begin{aligned} (11.7) \quad &\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N P\{Y_i \neq \bar{a} | X_i\} g_{il}(X_i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\rho} P(\tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) | Y_{-i}, X_i) \right) g_{il}(X_i) + v_{l,L}(\bar{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where $v_{l,L}(\bar{a}) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{1-\rho} R_{i,L}(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i)$.

Now it suffices to control $v_{l,U}(\bar{a})$ and $v_{l,L}(\bar{a})$. We write

$$\tilde{e}_{i,U}(\bar{a}) \equiv P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i\} - \frac{1}{1-\rho}P(\tilde{S}_{i,U}(\bar{a})|Y_{-i}, X_i)$$

and let $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{i,U}$ be a vector whose entries are $\tilde{e}_{i,U}(\bar{a})$ with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A}$. Similarly, we write

$$\tilde{e}_{i,L}(\bar{a}) \equiv P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i\} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\rho}P(\tilde{S}_{i,L}(\bar{a})|Y_{-i}, X_i)\right),$$

and let $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{i,L}$ be a vector whose entries are $\tilde{e}_{i,L}(\bar{a})$ with $\bar{a}$ running in $\mathbb{A}$. We let for a given vector of nonnegative constants $\mathbf{w}_U = (w_{l,U}(\bar{a}))_{l=1, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}}^L$ and $\mathbf{w}_L = (w_{l,L}(\bar{a}))_{l=1, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}}^L$,

$$(11.8) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_U, \mathbf{w}_L) \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_L(\mathbf{w}_L) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_U(\mathbf{w}_U),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_L(\mathbf{w}_L) &= \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{i,L} \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) + \mathbf{w}_L \geq 0 \right\} \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_U(\mathbf{w}_U) &= \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{i,U} \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) - \mathbf{w}_U \leq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (11.6) and (11.7),

$$(11.9) \quad P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_L(\mathbf{v}_L)|X\right) = 1 \text{ and } P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_U(\mathbf{v}_U)|X\right) = 1,$$

where $\mathbf{v}_L = (v_{l,L}(\bar{a}))_{l=1, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}}^L$ and $\mathbf{v}_U = (v_{l,U}(\bar{a}))_{l=1, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}}^L$. For $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$ as given in the theorem, define the event

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A \equiv \{\mathbf{v}_U \leq \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) \text{ and } \mathbf{v}_L \leq \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)\}.$$

Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} (11.10) \quad & P(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X))|X) \\ &= P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A|X\right) \\ &+ P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A^c|X\right). \end{aligned}$$

The first probability on the right hand side is increasing in $(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X))$. Hence by the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A$, and using (11.9), we find that

$$P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A|X\right) \geq P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A|X\right).$$

Since the event in the left-hand side probability is contained in that in the right-hand side probability, we deduce that

$$P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A|X\right) = P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A|X\right).$$

From this and (11.10), we conclude that

$$(11.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & P(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X), \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)) | X) \\ & \geq P(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A | X) = 1 - P(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A^c | X). \end{aligned}$$

Now, it suffices to obtain a bound for the last probability. For this, note that

$$(11.12) \quad P\{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A^c | X\} \leq P\{\mathbf{v}_U > \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) | X\} + P\{\mathbf{v}_L > \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X) | X\}.$$

We analyze the first probability only. The second probability can be analyzed similarly. We write

$$v_{l,U}(\bar{a}) = f_{l,U}(Y, X; \bar{a}) \text{ and } v_{l,L}(\bar{a}) = f_{l,L}(Y, X; \bar{a}),$$

for some functions $f_{l,U}(\cdot, \cdot; \bar{a})$ and $f_{l,L}(\cdot, \cdot; \bar{a})$. Then, note that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_j(f_{l,L}(\cdot, X; \bar{a})) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_j(\pi_{i,L}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a})) g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} = d_{jl,L}(\bar{a}) \text{ and} \\ V_j(f_{l,U}(\cdot, X; \bar{a})) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X_i; \bar{a})) g_{il}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i(\bar{a})} = d_{jl,U}(\bar{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equalities use the definition of $d_{jl,L}(\bar{a})$ and $d_{jl,U}(\bar{a})$. Note that $\mathbf{v}_U$ and $\mathbf{v}_L$ are nonstochastic functions of $(Y_1, \dots, Y_N, X)$, and by Assumption 3(iii), Y_i 's are conditionally independent given (X, C) . We use the definition of $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)$, and apply Lemma A1 to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} P\{\mathbf{v}_U > \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) | X, C\} &\leq \frac{\tau}{2} \text{ and} \\ P\{\mathbf{v}_L > \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X) | X, C\} &\leq \frac{\tau}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking conditional expectation given X on both sides of these inequalities and using (11.12), we have

$$P\{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_A^c | X\} \leq P\{\mathbf{v}_U > \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) | X\} + P\{\mathbf{v}_L > \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X) | X\} \leq \tau.$$

By applying this to (11.11), we obtain the desired inequality. ■

The following lemma is obtained by applying Basu (1988)'s result on CLT for Banach valued martingale difference arrays to $\mathbf{R}^d$ -valued martingale difference arrays. In contrast to Basu (1988), however, the current lemma gives a more explicit bound for the normal approximation. This explicit bound is crucial for our bootstrap validity that is uniform over a wide class of probabilities.

LEMMA A2: *Suppose that $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is a sequence of $\mathbf{R}^d$ -valued martingale difference arrays with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ with $d \geq 1$. Let $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and let Y_n be a normal random vector*

which has zero mean and covariance matrix equal to that of S_n . For this covariance matrix, we assume that its smallest eigenvalue is bounded from below by $c_n > 0$ for each $n \geq 1$. Furthermore, assume that for each $n \geq 1$,

$$(11.13) \quad P \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} [X_i X_i^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = V_n \right\} = 1, \text{ for some constant matrix } V_n.$$

Then,

$$\sup_{0 < r} |P \{ \|S_n\| \leq r \} - P \{ \|Y_n\| \leq r \}| \leq \frac{C_d}{c_n^{3/2}} \left(B_n^{-3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \|X_i\|^3 \right)^{1/4},$$

where $C_d > 0$ is a constant that depends only on d , and $B_n \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \|X_i\|^2}$.

PROOF : Since $c_n > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{r > 0} |P \{ \|S_n\| \leq r \} - P \{ \|Y_n\| \leq r \}| \\ &= \sup_{r > 0} |P \{ \|S_{n,c}\| \leq r \} - P \{ \|Y_{n,c}\| \leq r \}|, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_{n,c} = S_n / \sqrt{c_n}$ and $Y_{n,c} = Y_n / \sqrt{c_n}$. Then, certainly the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{E} [Y_{n,c} Y_{n,c}^\top]$ is bounded from below by 1. Suppose that there exists $C_d > 0$ satisfying that

$$(11.14) \quad P \{ r \leq \|Y_{n,c}\| < r + \varepsilon \} \leq \frac{C_d \varepsilon}{c_n^2},$$

for all $r \geq 0$, all $\varepsilon > 0$, and all $n \geq 1$, where $C_d > 0$ is a constant that depends only on d . Then by inspecting the proof of Theorem 1 of Basu (1988), we find that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{r > 0} |P \{ \|S_{n,c}\| \leq r \} - P \{ \|Y_{n,c}\| \leq r \}| \leq C_2 \varepsilon^{-3} \delta_n + \frac{C_1 \varepsilon}{c_n^2},$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is an absolute constant, and

$$\delta_n = B_n^{-3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \|X_i\|^3.$$

(To see that $C_2 > 0$ is an absolute constant, note that C_2 involves three constants $C_{1,1}, C_{1,2}$ and $C_{1,3}$, where $C_{1,1}$ is the constant that depends on the choice of f_n at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1 in Basu (1988), $C_{1,2}$ is the constant in (1.1) which can be taken to be 1 in our case with $\mathbf{R}^d$, and $C_{1,3}$ is the constant in Lemma 5 in Basu (1988) which is certainly an absolute constant that does not depend on the choice of a Gaussian random vector.)

It remains to show that there exists an absolute constant $C_1 > 0$ that satisfies (11.14). Once this is done, the proof is complete by choosing $\varepsilon = (C_2 \delta_n)^{1/4} (C_1 / c_n^2)^{-1/4}$.

Let $\Omega = \mathbf{E} Y_{n,c} Y_{n,c}^\top$. Then the spectral decomposition gives $\Omega = B \Lambda B^\top$, where B is an orthogonal matrix and Λ is a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues, $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, of Ω . Then, we have

for all r and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(11.15) \quad P\{r \leq \|Y_{n,c}\| < r + \varepsilon\} = P\{r \leq \|B^\top Y_{n,c}\| < r + \varepsilon\},$$

and $\mathbf{E}[B^\top Y_{n,c} Y_{n,c}^\top B] = B^\top \Omega B = \Lambda$. When $d = 1$ or 2 , it is not hard to show that the density of $\|B^\top Y_{n,c}\|$ is bounded, so that we have (11.14). Now let us focus on the case where $d \geq 3$. Let $f_{n,2}$ be the density function of $\|B^\top Y_{n,c}\|^2$ and $f_{n,1}$ that of $\|B^\top Y_{n,c}\|$, so that we have for $y > 0$,

$$(11.16) \quad f_{n,2}(y^2) = \frac{f_{n,1}(y)}{2y}.$$

Note that

$$B^\top Y_{n,c} = \sum_{j=1}^d Z_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} \mathbf{e}_j,$$

where $Z_j \sim i.i.d. N(0, 1)$ across j 's. By Lemma 3 of Linde and Rosinsky (1994), we find that

$$(11.17) \quad f_{n,2}(y) \leq \frac{1}{2c_n^2} P\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=3}^d Z_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} \mathbf{e}_j\right\|^2 \leq y\right\}.$$

Since $\sqrt{\lambda_j} \geq 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$ (through the division by $\sqrt{c_n}$ in the definition of $Y_{n,c}$), Theorem 1 of Jensen (1984) implies that the last probability is bounded by

$$P\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=3}^d Z_{n,j} \mathbf{e}_j\right\|^2 \leq y\right\} = G_{d-2}(y),$$

where $G_{d-2}(\cdot)$ is the CDF of χ_{d-2}^2 -distribution. Let $g_{d-2}(\cdot)$ be the density of χ_{d-2}^2 -distribution. Then certainly $C_d \equiv \sup_{y \geq 0} y g_{d-2}(y^2) < \infty$. Therefore, we have for all $y > 0$,

$$f_{n,1}(y) \leq \frac{y}{c_n^2} g_{d-2}(y^2) \leq \frac{C_d}{c_n^2}.$$

Thus we conclude from (11.15) that

$$P\{r \leq \|Y_{n,c}\| < r + \varepsilon\} = \int_r^{r+\varepsilon} f_{n,1}(y) dy \leq \frac{C_d \varepsilon}{c_n^2}.$$

Thus we obtain the desired result. ■

PROOF OF THEOREM A3: As in (5.4), we decompose $\mathbf{l}_U(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{l}_L(\theta)$ and apply Theorem 2 to obtain that

$$(11.18) \quad \mathbf{l}_U(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X) \leq \boldsymbol{\zeta} \leq \mathbf{l}_L(\theta) + \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X),$$

with probability at least $1 - \tau$. From (11.18), we find the inequality:

$$(11.19) \quad \left\| [\mathbf{l}_U(\theta) - \mathbf{w}_{\tau,U}(X)]_+ + [\mathbf{l}_L(\theta) + \mathbf{w}_{\tau,L}(X)]_- \right\|^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2,$$

with probability at least $1 - \tau$. Now, our asymptotic analysis focuses on $\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2$. For this, we show that $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ is the sum of martingale difference arrays, and use Lemma A2 above. However, we need to deal with the possibility that $\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ exhibits a degenerate distribution in the limit which is not allowed in Lemma A2. To deal with the case of asymptotically degenerate distribution in a way that is uniform over $P \in \mathcal{P}$, we use arguments similar to those in the proof of Theorem 2 of Lee, Song and Whang (2014).

First, we define a "regularized version" of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$. For this, fix a small number $0 < \lambda < 1/2$ and let $d \equiv L(K - 1)$, i.e., the dimension of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, and let $\{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,\lambda} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. $L(K - 1)$ -dimensional random vectors such that the entries are distributed i.i.d. as uniform $[-\sqrt{3}\lambda, \sqrt{3}\lambda]$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,\lambda}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is independent of $\{(Y_i, X_i, C)\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda} \equiv \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i + \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,\lambda}, \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\zeta}_\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \equiv \mathbf{r}_i^* \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$, $\mathbf{r}_i^*$ is a column vector of entries $r_i^*(\bar{a}) = 1\{Y_i = \bar{a}\} - P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i\}$ with $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,\lambda} \equiv \sigma\left(\{(Y_j)_{j=1}^i, (\mathbf{v}_{j,\lambda})_{j=1}^i, X, C\}\right), \quad \mathcal{F}_\lambda \equiv \cap_{i=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_{i,\lambda},$$

so that $\mathcal{F}_{i,\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ are σ -fields that are augmented with $(v_{k,\lambda})_{k=1}^i$. We define

$$\mathcal{F}_i \equiv \sigma\left(\{(Y_j)_{j=1}^i, X, C\}\right), \quad \mathcal{F} \equiv \cap_{i=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_i.$$

Note that $(Y_j, \mathbf{v}_{j,\lambda})$'s are conditionally independent across j 's given (X, C) . By the construction of $(\mathbf{v}_{j,\lambda})_{j=1}^i$, it is not hard to see that $\mathcal{F}_\lambda = \mathcal{F} = \sigma(X, C)$, i.e., the σ -field generated by (X, C) . Then we let the conditional CDF of $\|\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|$ given $\mathcal{F}$ be denoted by $F_\zeta(\cdot|\mathcal{F})$ and that of $\|\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\lambda\|$ given $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ be denoted by $F_{\zeta,\lambda}(\cdot|\mathcal{F}_\lambda)$. Also, we define

$$V_\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1,\lambda}].$$

Then, note that by design, we can show that $\|\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\lambda\|$ has a nondegenerate limiting distribution, even when $\|\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|$ is asymptotically degenerate, as long as $\lambda > 0$. The precise form of this claim is as follows, which we prove later.

Claim 1: There exists $C_d > 0$ such that for each $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$P\left\{\mathbf{E}\left[\sup_{t>0} |F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda) - F_{\zeta,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda)| | C\right] \leq C_d h_N(\lambda)\right\} = 1,$$

where $F_{\zeta,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda) \equiv P\{\|V_\lambda^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}\| \leq t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda\}$ and $\mathbb{Z} \sim N(0, I)$, independent of all the other random variables and

$$(11.20) \quad h_N(\lambda) \equiv \frac{\{C_g + \lambda^2\}^{1/4}}{\lambda^{15/4} N^{1/8}},$$

and $C_d > 0$ is a constant that depends only on the dimension d of the vector $\zeta_{i,\lambda}$.

Note that the L_1 -approximation error bound $h_N(\lambda)$ does not depend on $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Therefore, the bound in Claim 1 is uniform over $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Also, note that $h_N(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ for each $\lambda > 0$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \left\{ \sup_{t>0} |F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda) - F_{\zeta,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda)| > \eta \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t>0} |F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda) - F_{\zeta,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda)| \right] \leq \frac{C_d h_N(\lambda)}{\eta} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for each fixed $\lambda > 0$. In other words, the conditional distribution of $\|\sqrt{N}\zeta_\lambda\|$ given $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ is asymptotically approximated by that of $\|V_\lambda^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}\|$ uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

The second result that we establish below is that the distributional difference between $\sqrt{N}\zeta_\lambda$ and $\sqrt{N}\zeta$ is not very large, when $\lambda > 0$ is small enough.

Claim 2: For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each $\lambda \in (0, \eta_\varepsilon)$,

$$P \left\{ \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq \varepsilon} |F_\zeta(t|\mathcal{F}) - F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F})| | C \right] \leq C_3 \left(\sqrt{\lambda} + C_d h_N(\lambda) \right) + \lambda d \right\} = 1,$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Again, note that the bound $C_3\{\sqrt{\lambda} + C_d h_N(\lambda)\} + \lambda$ does not depend on $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence for each $\eta > 0$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \left\{ \sup_{t \geq \varepsilon} |F_\zeta(t|\mathcal{F}) - F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F})| > \eta \right\} \rightarrow 0.$$

Now we establish a bootstrap version of these results similarly. Define

$$\mathcal{G}_i \equiv \sigma \left((\varepsilon_{j,b})_{j=1}^i, Y, X \right), \quad \mathcal{G} \equiv \cap_{i=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_i,$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{i,\lambda} \equiv \sigma \left((\mathbf{v}_{j,\lambda})_{j=1}^i, (\varepsilon_{j,b})_{j=1}^i, Y, X \right), \quad \mathcal{G}_\lambda \equiv \cap_{i=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_{i,\lambda}.$$

By the construction of $(\mathbf{v}_{j,\lambda})_{j=1}^i$ and $(\varepsilon_{j,b})_{j=1}^i$, it is not hard to see that $\mathcal{G}_\lambda = \mathcal{G} = \sigma(Y, X)$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_i$ be a $(K-1)$ -dimensional vector whose entries are given by $1\{Y_i = \bar{a}_k\}$ with $k = 2, \dots, K$.

Let

$$\mathbf{Z} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i,$$

where

$$\mathbf{Z}_i \equiv \left(\mathbf{Y}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{Y}_j \otimes \mathbf{g}_j(X_j) \right) \varepsilon_{i,b}.$$

We also define again a regularize version of $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{Z}_\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda},$$

and

$$\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda} \equiv \left(\mathbf{Y}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Y}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) \right) + \mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda} \right) \varepsilon_{i,b}.$$

Let the conditional CDF of $\|\sqrt{N}\mathbf{Z}_\lambda\|$ given $\mathcal{G}_\lambda$ be denoted by $F_{Z,\lambda}(\cdot|\mathcal{G}_\lambda)$ and that of $\|\sqrt{N}\mathbf{Z}\|$ given $\mathcal{G}$ be denoted by $F_Z(\cdot|\mathcal{G})$. As for the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}$, let

$$W_\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda} \mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}^\top | \mathcal{G}_{i-1,\lambda}].$$

Then, we establish results similar to Claims 1 and 2 for $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_\lambda$.

Claim 3: There exists $C'_d > 0$ such that for each $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$P \left\{ \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t>0} |F_{Z,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{G}_\lambda) - F_{Z,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{G}_\lambda)| | C \right] \leq C'_d h_N(\lambda) \right\} = 1,$$

where $F_{Z,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{G}_\lambda) \equiv P\{W_\lambda^{1/2}\mathbb{Z} \leq t|\mathcal{G}_\lambda\}$, $C'_d > 0$ is a constant that depends only on d , and $h_N(\lambda)$ is as defined in (11.20).

Claim 4: For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each $\lambda \in (0, \eta_\varepsilon)$,

$$P \left\{ \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq \varepsilon} |F_Z(t|\mathcal{G}) - F_{Z,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{G})| | C \right] \leq C_3 \left(\sqrt{\lambda} + C'_d h_N(\lambda) \right) + \lambda d \right\} = 1,$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is an absolute constant.

The following result establishes that the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\lambda$ is first order stochastically dominated by that of $\sqrt{N}\mathbf{Z}_\lambda$.

Claim 5: For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$P \left\{ \inf_{t \geq \varepsilon} (F_{\zeta,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{F}_\lambda) - F_{Z,\lambda,\infty}(t|\mathcal{G}_\lambda)) \geq -C_{\varepsilon,d} \tilde{h}_N(\lambda) | C \right\} = 1,$$

where $C_{\varepsilon,d} > 0$ is a constant that depends only on $\varepsilon > 0$ and d , and

$$\tilde{h}_N(\lambda) = \lambda + \frac{d}{\lambda^3} \left(\sqrt{\frac{C_g}{N}} + \frac{C_g}{N} \right).$$

By chaining Claims 1-5, we find that the conditional distribution of $\sqrt{N}\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ is stochastically dominated by that of $\sqrt{N}\mathbf{Z}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, and hence obtain the desired result. Let $c_{1-\alpha,\infty}^*$ be the $(1 - \alpha + \tau)$ -th percentile of the bootstrap distribution of T_b^* . More specifically, observe that by the definition of $c_{1-\alpha,\infty}^*$,

$$1 - \alpha + \tau \leq F_Z(c_{1-\alpha,\infty}^* \vee \varepsilon | Y, X).$$

The last CDF is bounded by

$$P \{ \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2 \leq c_{1-\alpha,\infty}^* \vee \varepsilon | \mathcal{F} \} + o_P(1),$$

by Claims 4, 3, 1, and 2, after sending $N \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$. By (11.19), the leading probability is bounded by

$$P \{ T(\theta) \leq c_{1-\alpha,\infty}^* \vee \varepsilon | \mathcal{F} \} + \tau,$$

uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The last term τ is due to the fact that the probability that (11.19) fails is bounded by τ . Hence, the uniform asymptotic validity of the bootstrap is obtained.

Proof of Claim 1: Since X_i is part of T_i , Lemma 4.2(ii) of Dawid (1979) combined with Assumption 1 implies that T_i is conditionally independent of T_j 's with $j \neq i$ given (X_i, C) . Furthermore, Y_i is a function of $T_i = (\eta_i, X_i)$ and η_i is conditionally independent of C given X by Assumption 3(iii). Hence we have Y_i is conditionally independent of C given X . Thus we deduce that for each $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (11.21) \quad P \{ Y_i = \bar{a} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \} &= P \{ Y_i = \bar{a} | X, C \} \\ &= P \{ Y_i = \bar{a} | X_i \}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(Y_i, \mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda})$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{i,\lambda}$ for all $i \geq 1$, and $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1,\lambda}] = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$, we find that $\{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a martingale difference array with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\lambda}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ under the conditional probability $P\{\cdot | X, C\}$.

We apply the uniform bound for in the CLT in Lemma A2. First, note that by the definition of $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,\lambda}$,

$$(11.22) \quad \begin{aligned} V_\lambda &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] + \lambda^2 I \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^\top | X, C] + \lambda^2 I, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that Y_i is a function of (η_i, X_i) and η_i 's are conditionally independent given (X, C) . Therefore, V_λ is the covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\lambda$, and is almost everywhere constant with respect to the conditional probability $P\{\cdot | X, C\}$, satisfying (11.13) of Lemma A2. Furthermore, from (11.22), the minimum eigenvalue of V_λ is bounded from below by λ^2 everywhere, and λ does not depend on $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda}|^2 | X, C] \geq d\lambda^2,$$

where we recall $d \equiv L(K-1)$. Therefore, we can use Lemma A2 to deduce the following:

$$(11.23) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t>0} \left| P \left\{ \left\| \sqrt{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta} \right\| \leq t | X, C \right\} - P \left\{ \left\| V_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \leq t | X, C \right\} \right| | C \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C_d}{\lambda^{15/4} N^{1/8}} \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda}|^3 | X, C] \right)^{1/4} | C \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $C_d > 0$ is a constant that depends only on d . As for the last expectation in (11.23), we us Lyapounov's inequality and apply the law of iterated conditional expectations to bound it by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,\lambda}|^3 | C] \right)^{1/4} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (4\mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i|^3 | C] + 4\mathbf{E} [|\mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}|^3 | C]) \right)^{1/4} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{4}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i|^3 | C] + 4\lambda^2 d^{3/2} \right)^{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows because each entry of $\mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}$ takes values inside $[-1, 1]$, and $\|\mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}\| \leq \sqrt{d}$ and $\mathbf{E} [|\mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}|^2 | C] \leq \lambda^2 d$. As for the leading sum, we have with probability 1

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i|^3 | C] \leq \frac{d^{3/2}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq l \leq L} \|g_{il}(X_i)\|^3 | C \right] \leq d^{3/2} C_g,$$

by (8.8). Hence we obtain the bound for (11.23) as

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}C_d \{C_g + \lambda^2\}^{1/4}}{\lambda^{15/4} N^{1/8}}.$$

Redefining C_d to be $\sqrt{2}C_d$, we obtain the desired result.

Proof of Claim 2: First, we bound

$$|F_\zeta(t|\mathcal{F}) - F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F})| \leq P \left\{ \left| \left\| \sqrt{N}\zeta \right\| - t \right| \leq \Delta_\lambda | \mathcal{F} \right\},$$

where

$$\Delta_\lambda \equiv \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \nu_{i,\lambda} \right\|.$$

By Claim 1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t>0} \left| P \left\{ \left| \left\| \sqrt{N}\zeta \right\| - t \right| \leq \Delta_\lambda | \mathcal{F} \right\} - P \left\{ \left| \left\| V_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| - t \right| \leq \Delta_\lambda | \mathcal{F} \right\} \right| | C \right] \\ & \leq 2C_d h_N(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbb{Z}_\lambda$ be a centered normal random vector whose covariance matrix is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements equal to the eigenvalues of V_λ . We write

$$\begin{aligned} (11.24) \quad & P \left\{ \left| \left\| V_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| - t \right| \leq \Delta_\lambda | \mathcal{F} \right\} \\ & = P \left\{ \left| \left\| \mathbb{Z}_\lambda \right\| - t \right| \leq \Delta_\lambda \text{ and } \Delta_\lambda \leq \sqrt{\lambda} | \mathcal{F} \right\} \\ & \quad + P \left\{ \left| \left\| \mathbb{Z}_\lambda \right\| - t \right| \leq \Delta_\lambda \text{ and } \Delta_\lambda > \sqrt{\lambda} | \mathcal{F} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first probability is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \left(t - \sqrt{\lambda} \right)^2 \leq \left\| \mathbb{Z}_\lambda \right\|^2 \leq \left(t + \sqrt{\lambda} \right)^2 | \mathcal{F} \right\} \\ & \leq \int_{(t-\sqrt{\lambda})^2}^{(t+\sqrt{\lambda})^2} f_\lambda(y|\mathcal{F}) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_\lambda(y|\mathcal{F})$ denotes the conditional density of $\left\| \mathbb{Z}_\lambda \right\|^2$ given $\mathcal{F}$. Note that $\mathbb{Z}_\lambda$ is conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}$ given V_λ . Furthermore, the density $f_\lambda(\cdot|\mathcal{F})$ is unimodal, and there exist absolute constants $\eta > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ that do not depend on λ and for each $t \geq \varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in [t-\eta, t+\eta]} f_\lambda(x|\mathcal{F}) \leq C_2.$$

This is because the neighborhood $[t - \eta, t + \eta]$ is away from zero for small η 's. Therefore, for all $\lambda < \eta^2$,

$$\int_{(t-\sqrt{\lambda})^2}^{(t+\sqrt{\lambda})^2} f_\lambda(y|\mathcal{F}) dy \leq \int_{(t-\sqrt{\lambda})^2}^{(t+\sqrt{\lambda})^2} C_2 dy = 4C_2\sqrt{\lambda}.$$

The second probability in (11.24) is bounded by (for some $c_1 > 0$)

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,\lambda} \right\|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{\lambda N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,\lambda}|^2] \leq \lambda d.$$

We conclude that there exists $\eta_1 > 0$ such that for each $t \geq \varepsilon$ and each $\lambda \in (0, \eta_1)$,

$$\mathbf{E} [|F_\zeta(t|\mathcal{F}) - F_{\zeta,\lambda}(t|\mathcal{F})| |C] \leq C_3 \left(\sqrt{\lambda} + C_d h_N(\lambda) \right) + \lambda d,$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof of Claim 3: We find that $\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda} | \mathcal{G}_{i-1,\lambda}] = 0$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}$ is $\mathcal{G}_{i,\lambda}$ -measurable for each $i \geq 1$. Hence $\{\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a martingale difference array with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{G}_{i,\lambda}\}_{i=1}^\infty$. We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} W_\lambda &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i^\top | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}] + \lambda^2 I \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i^\top | Y, X] + \lambda^2 I \geq \lambda^2 I. \end{aligned}$$

Certainly, W_λ is the conditional covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Z}_\lambda$ given (Y, X) , and is almost everywhere constant given (Y, X) . Also, note that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}|^2 | Y, X] \geq \lambda^2 d.$$

For $\gamma_i = \max_{1 \leq l \leq L} \|g_{il}(X_i)\|^3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (11.25) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [|\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}|^3 | Y, X] &\leq 4d^{3/2} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i + \lambda^2 \right) \mathbf{E} [|\varepsilon_{i,b}|^3] \\ &= 8\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} d^{3/2} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i + \lambda^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can use Lemma A2 to deduce the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t>0} \left| P \left\{ \left\| \sqrt{N} \mathbf{Z} \right\| \leq t | Y, X \right\} - P \left\{ \|W_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z}\| \leq t | Y, X \right\} \right| | C \right] \\ & \leq \frac{C_{1,d}}{\lambda^{15/4} N^{1/8}} \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\|\mathbf{Z}_{i,\lambda}\|^3 | Y, X] \right)^{1/4} | C \right], \end{aligned}$$

with probability one, where $C_{1,d} > 0$ and $C_{2,d} > 0$ are positive constants that depend on d . From (11.25) and the condition (8.8), the last bound is again bounded by

$$\frac{2^{3/8} \pi^{1/8} C_{1,d} (C_g + \lambda^2)^{1/4}}{\lambda^{15/4} N^{1/8}}.$$

Taking $C'_d = 2^{3/8} \pi^{1/8} C_{1,d}$, we obtain the desired result.

Proof of Claim 4: The proof is precisely equal to that of Claim 2 with V_λ replaced by W_λ , and the conditional probabilities given $\mathcal{F}$ replaced by conditional probabilities given $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof of Claim 5: Let $\mathbf{y}_{i,g} = \mathbf{Y}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)$. Note that

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i = \mathbf{y}_{i,g} - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}].$$

We write $V_\lambda = V + \lambda^2 I$, where

$$\begin{aligned} (11.26) \quad V &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]). \end{aligned}$$

We define $\bar{W}_\lambda = \bar{W} + \lambda^2 I$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (11.26), we have (everywhere)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W}_\lambda - V_\lambda &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\bar{W}_\lambda \geq V_\lambda$ everywhere. By Theorem 1 of Jensen (1984), we have

$$(11.27) \quad P \{ \|V_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\| \leq t | X, C \} \geq P \{ \|\bar{W}_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\| \leq t | X, C \},$$

because $\mathbb{Z}$ is independent of (X, C) . It remains to compare $\bar{W}_\lambda$ with W_λ .

First, observe that $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | X_i]$, as we saw in (11.21), and hence $\bar{W}_\lambda$ is a function of X only. Hence,

$$(11.28) \quad \begin{aligned} P \{ \|\bar{W}_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\| \leq t | X, C \} &= P \{ \|\bar{W}_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\| \leq t | X \} \\ &= P \{ \|\bar{W}_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\| \leq t | Y, X \}, \end{aligned}$$

because $\mathbb{Z}$ is independent of (Y, X, C) .

Now, we deal with the difference between the conditional distribution of $\|\bar{W}_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\|$ given (Y, X) and that of $\|W_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\|$. First, we find that

$$(11.29) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| P \left\{ \left\| \bar{W}_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \leq t | Y, X \right\} - P \left\{ \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \leq t | Y, X \right\} \right| \\ & \leq P \left\{ t - \tilde{\Delta}_\lambda \leq \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \leq t + \tilde{\Delta}_\lambda | Y, X \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}_\lambda = \left| \left\| \bar{W}_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| - \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \right|$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}_\lambda &= \left| \left\| \bar{W}_\lambda^{1/2} \right\| - \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \right\| \right| \|\mathbb{Z}\| \leq \frac{\left| \left\| \bar{W}_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|^2 - \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|^2 \right| \|\mathbb{Z}\|}{\left\| \bar{W}_\lambda^{1/2} \right\| + \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|} \\ &\leq \frac{|tr(\bar{W}_\lambda - W_\lambda)| \|\mathbb{Z}\|}{2\lambda\sqrt{d}}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $\kappa \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and bound the last probability in (11.29) from below by

$$(11.30) \quad \begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \frac{t - \tilde{\Delta}_\lambda}{\lambda} \leq \|\mathbb{Z}\| \leq \frac{t + \tilde{\Delta}_\lambda}{\lambda} | Y, X \right\} \\ & \leq P \left\{ \frac{t - \kappa}{\lambda} \leq \|\mathbb{Z}\| \leq \frac{t + \kappa}{\lambda} | Y, X \right\} + P \left\{ \tilde{\Delta}_\lambda > \kappa | Y, X \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second probability is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\lambda\kappa\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{E} \left[|tr(W_\lambda - \bar{W}_\lambda)| \|\mathbb{Z}\| | Y, X \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\lambda\kappa\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{E} \left[|tr(W_\lambda - \bar{W}_\lambda)| | Y, X \right] \mathbf{E} [\|\mathbb{Z}\|] \leq \frac{\mathbf{E} [|tr(W_\lambda - \bar{W}_\lambda)| | Y, X]}{2\lambda\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

We write

$$W_\lambda - \bar{W}_\lambda = \xi_{1,N} + \xi_{2,N},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{1,N} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{y}_{i,g} \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top - \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]) \\ \xi_{2,N} &= \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{y}_{i,g} \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top \right).\end{aligned}$$

First, note that $\xi_{1,N}$ is the sum of uncorrelated matrices. Hence using (8.8),

$$(11.31) \quad \mathbf{E} [\|\xi_{1,N}\|^2 | C] \leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\|\mathbf{y}_{i,g}\|^4 | C] \leq \frac{d^2 C_g}{N}.$$

Second, we write $\xi_{2,N}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}& \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top) \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{y}_{i,g}^\top \\ & = A_{1N} + A_{2N}, \text{ say.}\end{aligned}$$

As for $\|A_{1N}\|$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right\| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\|\mathbf{y}_{i,g}\|^4 | X, C] \right)^{1/4} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | X, C] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right\|.\end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lyapounov inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [||A_{1N}|| | C] &\leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [||\mathbf{y}_{i,g}||^4 | C] \right)^{1/4} \\
&\quad \times \sqrt{\mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | X, C] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right\|^2 \middle| C \right]} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [||\mathbf{y}_{i,g}||^4 | C] \right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [||\mathbf{y}_{i,g}||^2 | C]} \\
&\leq C_g^{1/4} \sqrt{d} \times \frac{\sqrt{d} C_g^{1/4}}{\sqrt{N}} = \frac{C_g^{1/2} d}{\sqrt{N}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $||A_{2N}||$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{y}_{i,g} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{E} [\mathbf{y}_{i,g} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbf{y}_{i,g}) \right\|,
\end{aligned}$$

and we have

$$\mathbf{E} [||A_{2N}|| | C] \leq \frac{C_g d}{N} + \frac{C_g^{1/2} d}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{E} [||\xi_{2,N}|| | C] \leq \frac{C_g d}{N} + \frac{2C_g^{1/2} d}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Combining this with (11.31), we find that

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda\kappa} \mathbf{E} [||tr(\bar{W}_\lambda - W_\lambda)|| | C] \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda\kappa} \left\{ \frac{3dC_g^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{C_g d}{N} \right\}.$$

Therefore, from (11.29) and (11.30),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq \varepsilon} \left| P \left\{ \left\| \bar{W}_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \leq t | Y, X \right\} - P \left\{ \left\| W_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z} \right\| \leq t | Y, X \right\} \right| \middle| C \right] \\
& \leq \sup_{t \geq \varepsilon} P \left\{ \frac{t - \kappa}{\lambda} \leq \|\mathbb{Z}\| \leq \frac{t + \kappa}{\lambda} \right\} + \frac{1}{2\lambda\kappa} \left\{ \frac{3dC_g^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{C_g d}{N} \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{C_5 \kappa}{\lambda} + \frac{d}{2\lambda\kappa} \left(\frac{3C_g^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{C_g}{N} \right) \leq C'_d \tilde{h}_N(\lambda),
\end{aligned}$$

once we take $\kappa = \lambda^2$ and collect the absolute constants into a larger one $C'_d > 0$. The first inequality uses the fact that $\mathbb{Z}$ is independent of (Y, X) . Combining this with (11.27) and (11.28), we obtain the desired result. ■

PROOF OF THEOREM A4: We write

$$\mathbf{l}_{U,b}^*(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\mathbf{r}_i^* + \mathbf{e}_{i,U}(\theta)) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) \varepsilon_{i,b}.$$

The conditional covariance matrix of $\mathbf{l}_{U,b}^*(\theta)$ given (Y, X) has entries of the following form: with $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \{r_i^*(\bar{a}) + e_{i,U}(\bar{a})\} \{r_i^*(\bar{a}) + e_{i,U}(\bar{a})\} g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i) \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^*(\bar{a}) r_i^*(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (r_i^*(\bar{a}) e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) + r_i^*(\bar{a}) e_{i,U}(\bar{a})) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i).
\end{aligned}$$

We show that the last sum is asymptotically negligible. We focus only on

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^*(\bar{a}) e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i).$$

By Assumption 1, (X_i, Y_i) and Y_{-i} are conditionally independent given C . Hence by Lemma 4.1 of Dawid (1979), (X_i, Y_i, C) and (Y_{-i}, C) are conditionally independent given C . By Lemma 4.2 of Dawid (1979), (X_i, Y_i, C) and (Y_{-i}, C) are conditionally independent given (X_i, C) . By the property of conditional independence, this implies that (X_i, Y_i) and (Y_{-i}, C) are conditionally independent given (X_i, C) . Applying Lemma 4.1 of Dawid (1979) again,

we conclude that (X_i, Y_i) and (X_i, Y_{-i}, C) are conditionally independent given (X_i, C) . Now since $e_{i,U}(a)$ is a function of (X_i, Y_{-i}, C) only and $r_i^*(\bar{a})$ is a function of (Y_i, X_i) only, we have for any $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bar{a}_1\}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[r_i^*(\bar{a})e_{i,U}(\bar{a})|X_i, C] = \mathbf{E}[r_i^*(\bar{a})|X_i, C]\mathbf{E}[e_{i,U}(\bar{a})|X_i, C].$$

Now,

$$\mathbf{E}[r_i^*(\bar{a})|X_i, C] = P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i, C\} - P\{Y_i = \bar{a}|X_i\} = 0,$$

where the last equality follows by Assumption 3(ii). Therefore, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{E}[r_i^*(\bar{a})e_{i,U}(\bar{a})g_{il}(X_i)g_{ik}(X_i)|X, C] = 0.$$

Note that $r_i^*(\bar{a})e_{i,U}(\bar{a})g_{il}(X_i)g_{ik}(X_i)$ is a function of (Y, X, C) , and hence we write

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^*(\bar{a})e_{i,U}(\bar{a})g_{il}(X_i)g_{ik}(X_i) = w_{lk}(Y, X, C; \bar{a})$$

for some function w_{lk} . Then, observe that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_j(w_{lk}(\cdot, X, C; \bar{a})) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^N \frac{|r_i^*(\bar{a})|V_j(\pi_{i,U}(\cdot, X, \bar{a}))g_{il}(X_i)g_{ik}(X_i)}{1 - \rho_i} + \frac{g_{jl}(X_j)g_{jk}(X_j)}{N(1 - \rho_j)} \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}(\bar{a})}{1 - \rho} + \frac{g_{jl}(X_j)g_{jk}(X_j)}{N(1 - \rho)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$V_j(w_{lk}(\cdot, X, C; \bar{a})) \leq \frac{\tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}(\bar{a})}{1 - \rho}.$$

We fix any $\eta > 0$, and observe the following: for some absolute constant $C_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^*(\bar{a})e_{i,U}(\bar{a})g_{il}(X_i)g_{ik}(X_i) \right| > \eta | X, C \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left(- \frac{2\eta C_1}{2 \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}^2(\bar{a}) + N^{-2}g_{jl}^2(X_j)g_{jk}^2(X_j) \right\} / (1 - \rho)^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma A2. By the condition of the theorem, we have as $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\max_{1 \leq l, k \leq L} \max_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{A}} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}^2(\bar{a}) + \frac{g_{jl}^2(X_j)g_{jk}^2(X_j)}{N^2} \right\} | C \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, there exists a sequence $a_N \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$P \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \tilde{d}_{j,lk,U}^2(\bar{a}) + \frac{g_{jl}^2(X_j)g_{jk}^2(X_j)}{N^2} \right\} > a_N \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We conclude that

$$P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^*(\bar{a}) e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i) \right| > \eta |C \right\} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i^*(\bar{a}) e_{i,U}(\bar{a}) g_{il}(X_i) g_{ik}(X_i) = o_P(1).$$

This implies that the conditional covariance matrix of $\mathbf{l}_{U,b}^*(\theta)$ given (Y, X) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{r}_i^* \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) (\mathbf{r}_i^* \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i))^\top \\ & + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{e}_{i,U}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) (\mathbf{e}_{i,U}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i))^\top + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the conditional covariance matrix of $\mathbf{l}_{L,b}^*(\theta)$ given (Y, X) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{r}_i^* \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) (\mathbf{r}_i^* \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i))^\top \\ & + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{e}_{i,L}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i)) (\mathbf{e}_{i,L}(\theta) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i))^\top + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of $\mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\lambda,U}^*(\theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\mathbf{r}_i^* + \mathbf{e}_{i,U}(\theta)) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) + \mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}) \varepsilon_{i,b} \text{ and} \\ \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\lambda,L}^*(\theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\mathbf{r}_i^* + \mathbf{e}_{i,L}(\theta)) \otimes \mathbf{g}_i(X_i) + \mathbf{v}_{i,\lambda}) \varepsilon_{i,b} \end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Theorem A3, we can show that the conditional distribution of

$$T_{\lambda,b}^{Mod*}(\theta) = \left\| [\sqrt{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\lambda,U}^*(\theta)]_+ + [\sqrt{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\lambda,L}^*(\theta)]_- \right\|^2$$

given (Y, X) stochastically dominates that of $\|V_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{Z}\|^2$. Finally, we control the difference between the conditional distribution of $T_{\lambda,b}^{Mod*}(\theta)$ given (Y, X) and that of $T_b^{Mod*}(\theta)$ given (Y, X) as in the proof of Claim 4 in the proof of Theorem A3. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] Basu, A. K. (1988): “Uniform and Nonuniform Estimates in the CLT for Banach Valued Dependent Random Variables,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 25, 153-163.

- [2] Dawid, A. P. (1979): “Conditional Independence in Statistical Theory,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B.* 41, 1-31.
- [3] Jensen, D. R. (1984): “Ordering Ellipsoidal Measures: Scale and Peakness Ordering,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 44, 1226-1231.
- [4] Lee, S., K. Song, and Y.-J., Whang (2014): “Testing for a General Class of Functional Inequalities,” *arXiv:1311.1595v3*
- [5] Linde, W. and J. Rosinsky (1994): “Exact Behavior of Gaussian Measures of Translated Balls in Hilbert Spaces,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 50, 1-16.
- [6] McDiarmid, C. (1989): “On the Method of Bounded Differences,” In *Surveys in Combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [7] Serre, D. (2010): *Matrices: Theory and Applications*, Springer.

VANCOUVER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 997 - 1873 EAST MALL,
VANCOUVER, BC, V6T 1Z1, CANADA

E-mail address: kysong@mail.ubc.ca